



LIBRARY
OF THE
Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

BT 1101 .W15
Wainwright, Samuel.
Christian certainty

A donation to the Library
from Levi P. Stone Esq.

CHRISTIAN CERTAINTY.

BY

SAMUEL WAINWRIGHT,

VICAR OF HOLY TRINITY, MICKLEGATE, YORK;

AUTHOR OF

“Voices from the Sanctuary.”

Εἰς ἀπολογίαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου κεῖματι.

ST. PAUL.

That thou mightest know THE CERTAINTY of those things wherein thou
hast been instructed. ST. LUKE.

LONDON :
HATCHARD AND CO., 187, PICCADILLY.

Booksellers to H.R.H. The Princess of Wales.

MDCCCLXV.

TO

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE
RICHARD, LORD WESTBURY,
Lord High Chancellor of England,

IN ADMIRATION OF THOSE GREAT ABILITIES WHICH ARE THE ORNAMENT OF HIS
HIGH POSITION;

AND

APPRECIATION OF THE VALUE OF HIS MEASURE FOR AUGMENTING
SMALL ENDOWMENTS;

THIS VINDICATION
OF
The Certainty of the Christian Faith
is,
BY HIS LORDSHIP'S PERMISSION,
DEDICATED,

WITH MOST RESPECTFUL REGARD AND ESTEEM.

INTRODUCTION.

AN unnecessary Preface is as tedious as the tatler who stops you in the street, bores you with his budget of nothings, and—lest you should escape the full infliction—holds you fast by the button. But when the preface is really needed it is another affair. It is then something more than an author's bow to his readers: a bow too often as awkward as it is unmeaning. It is a conspectus of his book; a statement of the object at which it aims, the method by which it proceeds, or the reasons for which it appears.

“ADSUMUS. With no pregnant words, that tremble
With awful purpose, take we leave to come:
Yet, when one enters where one's friends assemble,
'Tis not good manners to be wholly dumb.”

Those of my readers who are familiar with what I have already written on this subject will readily believe that it is from no lack of appreciation of what has since been published, if I entertain the conviction that there yet remains both room and reason for something more. The following pages are not intended as an addition to the numerous publications which have already appeared on some single topic of the general subject: still less are they intended to supplement those scholarly refutations which comprise the whole. But between these two—surveying the whole field indeed, yet examining only the most prominent objects; not avoiding even the most abstruse topics, but avoiding an abstruse

method in handling them ; combining to some extent the distinctness of smaller treatises with the comprehensiveness of larger ones ;—there might be a book which should be by no means superfluous.

Such a book might also, with much propriety, point out the most prominent features of the contrast between the uncertain assumptions of infidelity and the assured certainty of faith. Without detailing all the processes of investigation by which the most certain results have been reached ; without even enumerating all the results themselves ; it might yet present enough of both to dissipate the doubts of a sincere enquirer, and the fears of a timid believer. To that large class of persons to whom “a great book is a great evil,” a manual such as that now indicated, would be most valuable. Such is the ideal of this little volume : how far that ideal has been realized my readers will decide.

It is only natural that for some time yet to come, the attitude of a Christian apologist should be assumed with reference to that of the now exploded “Essays and Reviews,” supplemented as they have been by “The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically Examined.” Set for the defence of the Gospel ; combating that hardihood of assertion which is assumed to impose upon the uninformed ; detecting those specious sophisms designed to seduce the unwary ; and finding so much of both in these last pretentious books on the side of unbelief : what can be more natural than that, tacitly if not explicitly, his own course should be taken with direct reference to that of his adversaries ? The following pages have no other concern however with “Essays and Reviews,” or the astounding production of the Bishop of Natal, than as defending those “First Truths” which have been therein so malignantly attacked. Hence though not put in by way of answer, they stand out in direct antagonism.

The seven “Essays” are by no means equal, either in merit or importance. The First is too plainly opposed to notorious facts, the Fourth to common honesty, and the Fifth to common sense, to be capable of doing much mischief. It is with the subjects of the remaining four that we have chiefly, though incidentally, to do: the reality of prophecy, the certainty of miracles, the veracity of Moses, and the interpretation of Scripture.

Grouped around these principal topics are others, subordinate indeed but not unimportant, which alike deserve and demand our attention. The systematic disbelief exhibited in the “Essays,” and in the *Examination* of Dr. Colenso, is a phenomenon more striking than singular. It does not stand alone. It is fraught with the most fatal consequences: (why should it fear to be judged by them?) and these consequences are to be borne in mind when we consider its character. For it is these which afford the practical demonstration of that character. What it is practically, that it is actually: for the practical is the actual. Nor is this all. We may test the worth of its promises by examining the merit of its performances: try what it seeks to do by what it has already done. For it is no new thing. It has a history. If that history is one which its friends are ashamed to own, so much the worse for it and for them; but they who know the steady light which the actual receives from the historical will not walk in darkness, but make that light their own. By its aid we shall clearly perceive how, in that edifice of disbelief where many begin to build but no one is able to finish, the gaping walls are bedaubed with untempered mortar; how weak arguments are propped up by strong assertions; how baseless assumptions and positive untruths are dignified by pompous designations, as the triumphant masterpieces of Kant’s “pure reason,” or—better still—the *intuitional* conceptions of Williams’s “verifying faculty.”

Such is the edifice we are about to survey; and such some of the salient points which obtrude themselves upon our notice.

THE DIFFICULTIES FELT BY SOME; THE DOUBTS WHICH PERPLEX MANY; THE SOPHISMS WHICH BEWILDER MORE; AND LASTLY AND CHIEFLY, THE IMMOVEABLE AND INFALLIBLE CERTAINTY WHICH IS WITHIN THE REACH OF ALL: THESE ARE THE DIVISIONS OF OUR SUBJECT.

In every department of knowledge—but especially in its highest department—“a wise man will hear, and will increase learning; and a man of understanding shall attain unto wise counsels.” Not the perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds; not the short-lived speculations of men who though ever learning are never able to come to the knowledge of the truth; but to “wise counsels.” To the fear of the Lord, which is the beginning of wisdom, and the secret of the Lord, which is with them that fear Him; the knowledge of the true God, and of Jesus Christ whom He has sent; the knowledge of a divine enlightening, and of things which accompany salvation; the incomparable magnificence of the “kingdom which cannot be moved;” and the abiding, infallible CERTAINTY of the things wherein he has been instructed.

ANALYTICAL OUTLINE OF CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

PART I. DIFFICULTIES.

CHAPTER I. THEIR SOURCES.

I. DIFFICULTIES

1. As to the matter of Divine Revelation :	PAGE 35
Arising from	
The nature of the subject,	
The relation of the finite to the Infinite,	
The origin of evil,	
Necessary ignorance,	
Human incapacity.	
2. As to the manner :	
Poverty of language,	
Necessity of translation,	
Inaccurate transcription.	

II. DIFFICULTIES ARISING FROM MISREPRESENTATION.

Ju. i. 19.	44
Ge. i. 8.	
Ex. xii. 35, 36.	

III. DIFFICULTIES ARISING FROM IGNORANCE OR MISTAKE.

1 Ki. vii. 13. cf. 2 Ch. ii. 13.	47
Ma. xxvii. 44. cf. Lu. xxiii. 39.	
He. ix. 3, 4. cf. 1 Ki. viii. 9.	

CHAPTER II. THEIR SOLUTION.

I. FROM THE BIBLE ITSELF.

2 Sa. xviii. 6. cf. Ju. xii. 6.	
Eze. xii. 13. cf. Je. xxxiv. 3.	
2 Ki. xvi. 9. cf. 2 Ch. xxviii. 20.	
Ac. ix. 7. cf. Ac. xxii. 9.	
Ac. i. 18 cf. Ma. xxvii. 7.	

BISHOP COLENSO'S DIFFICULTIES:

PAGE 57

Not new;

Not formidable;

Derive their interest from the position of the propounder.

1. As to Hezron and Hamul.

This difficulty depends

a. On a statement of the Bishop's opinion

Not found in the Text,

Not implied in the Text,

Not warranted by the *usus loquendi*.

b. On a miscalculation of Judah's age.

c. On a positive misquotation of Scripture.

2. As to the sacred shekel.

This too, depends entirely on a misquotation.

3. The Priests' duties. To sustain this objection, the Bishop

a. Violates the canon "qui facit per alterum facit per se."

b. Ignores the common usage of the English language.

c. Contradicts the express letter of the Hebrew Text.

d. Disregards the usage elsewhere; and

e. The impersonal rendering of the Versions.

4. Their "perquisites." Objection: What could they do with them?

Answer: How were they to get them? For

a. Even those which were obligatory were not offered:

b. They could not be encumbered with "flour" when they had nothing but manna:

c. Nor could they eat 88 pigeons a-day when not a single pigeon was to be had.

5. a. The Law was intended for the wilderness, says the objector: But the Lawgiver says the contrary—at least five times over.

b. The Feast of Tabernacles: another instance of the grossest blundering.

6. Objection: The Author of "Deuteronomy" cannot be the same as the Author of "Numbers." For the interval in the change of style is one of "a few days or weeks at most."

Answer: The interval is one of nearly thirty-nine years.

7.	The Bishop's ridiculous ignorance of Hebrew.	
a.	Dr. Adler, and Dr. Benisch.	
b.	Booths and tents.	
c.	Refutation of his assertion of the meaning of סְכָה Succah (booth). הַזֶּה Hazzeh (this). פֶּתַח Pethach (door).	
8.	Character of his objections.	
9.	Completeness of the replies.	
10.	Colenso's careful avoidance of them.	
11.	His inconsistencies.	
12.	His impotence.	
II.	FROM OTHER SOURCES	PAGE 74
1.	Critical: Philippi; Ac. xvi. 12. Belshazzar; Col. Rawlinson's discovery. Jewish modes of reckoning.	
2.	Moral: E. g., The origin of evil.	

PART II. DOUBTS.

CHAPTER III.

DOUBTS ARISING FROM LITERARY CRITICISM:		87
I.	As to the Books of Scripture.	
1.	The relation of the Christian Records to the Christian Evidences.	
2.	Their genuineness, Their authenticity, Their canonicity.	
3.	Abandonment of the Straussian attacks upon the Gospels, in favour of the attack on the unity of the Pentateuch.	
4.	The Divine Names: Jehovah-Elohim.	
a.	They present no such distinctions as would be required to support the theory of disintegration.	
b.	Even if they did, their character as Inspired Scripture would remain unchanged.	
c.	As actually found however, they possess an instructive significance, such that	
d.	The widest apparent diversity serves but to demonstrate the reality of the actual unity.	

5. Next—in severity and importance—to the attacks on the Pentateuch, have been those on the genuineness, the authenticity, and the canonicity of Daniel.
 - a. And not without reason: For the authority of this book is fatal to the very existence of infidelity.
 - b. Detailed examination of objections: Demonstration of their futility: The positive evidence, conclusive and irrefragable.
6. The Apocrypha, no part of Scripture.
7. Canonicity of New Testament writings indisputable.
 - a. Genuineness of those that once were doubted.
 - b. Origin and extent of such doubts.
 - c. E. g., The authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews.
 - d. As in the Old Testament, so in the New, the inspiration of the canonical writings receives further and conclusive demonstration from a comparison with those that are apocryphal.

CHAPTER IV.

DOUBTS ARISING FROM LITERARY CRITICISM:

PAGE 126

II. As to the Contents of the Books.

Their integrity;

Their meaning;

Their inspiration.

1. The question stated.
2. The evidence adduced: by which it is proved that in the first century of the Christian era (and in the case of the Old Testament, at least two centuries earlier,) there existed and were known throughout the Roman world, books called the Sacred Scriptures, written by inspired men, and that THE PRESENT TEXT OF THE BIBLE IS IDENTICAL WITH THE TEXT WHICH THOSE BOOKS CONTAINED.
3. This conclusion not affected by a comparison of various readings.

CHAPTER V. INTERPRETATION.

SECTION I. VARIETIES OF INTERPRETATION

138

1. Are inevitable.
2. They are the result of
 - a. Predisposition on the part of the reader,
 - b. Ambiguity on the part of the writer,
 - c. The supernaturalism of the subject.
E. g., Shakspeare. Aeschylus. Dante. The Vedas. The Koran.

3. But the true method—neither arbitrary nor uncertain—can result only from the recognition of established and invariable principles.

SECTION II. PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION. PAGE 151

Figurative language not peculiar to the Bible.

The language of nature is the language of figure.

The significance of single words.

The figurativeness of their simplest combinations.

I. 1. First Rule: Ascertain the general usage.
 2. The figurative must be interpreted by the literal: not the literal by the figurative.
 3. Idiomatic expressions: e. g.—

To hate=to love less.

Son=any descendant; and father=any ancestor.

Brother=any collateral relation.

The use of the future for the imperative.

4. Semi-Hebraisms:
 a. As to numbers;
 b. As to names; Of Persons; Of Places.
 The illustrative significance of proper names.

II. Second Rule: Ascertain the sense of the general usage in that particular connection.

1. For the same word has often (in different connections) a diversity of senses so great as to amount almost to opposition.
 2. But this is no peculiarity of Biblical language;
 3. It is a natural consequence of the growth of the derived signification from the original.

III. Third Rule: Compare Scripture with Scripture.

1. As to doctrines;
 2. As to promises;
 3. As to threatenings.
 4. The neglect of this principle is the most fruitful source of error; while its observance is the surest guide to truth.

IV. Parables and Allegories:

1. Must be interpreted so that the minor details shall subserve the general design;
 2. And yet not be systematically overlooked.
 3. Are potent for illustration, but not for argument.
 4. Types: Bp. Marsh's definition.
 5. Fancy interpretations are the result of the neglect of these rules:

- a. By allegorizing on the *words* of Scripture.
- b. By so allegorizing as to destroy the *facts* of Scripture.
- c. By so allegorizing as to regard the obvious and historic sense of Scripture as comparatively unimportant, if not altogether untrue; while the spiritual or allegorical (though often merely imaginary) is alone deemed worthy of an enlightened mind.

Barnabas. Clement. Cyril. Origen. Lampe. Bellarmine.

V. The “most infallible rule” of all:

“Where a literal construction will stand, the farthest from the letter is commonly the worst.” Hooker. Melancthon. Luther.

VI. The most essential of all.

The spirit of humility; of faith; of prayer.

“The interpretation of Scripture requires ‘a vision and a faculty divine.’” Ep. Horsley. Prof. Jowett.

CHAPTER VI. INSPIRATION.

PAGE 179

The question stated.

Its importance.

Refutation of negative assertions.

Irreconcileable inconsistency of negative theories.

Erroneous theories reducible to three:—

I. That the inspiration of the Sacred Writers is not peculiar to themselves: Parker. Schleiermacher. De Wette.

II. The mechanical theory.

III. The partial theory.

IV. The true theory (Plenary).

Refutation of objections to it:—

First, That its assumptions are unwarranted by Scripture.

Second, That Scripture and Science are at variance.

Third, That it is disproved by the contradictions of Scripture.

THE ACTUAL INSPIRATION OF HOLY SCRIPTURE, then, is PLENARY:

For it

Is that of suggestion,

And that of superintendence.

It is also Verbal. (A threefold distinction.)

And is thus ratified—as to its minutest words—by

The testimony of our Lord

And of His Apostles.

CHAPTER VII.

DOUBTS ARISING FROM SCIENTIFIC INVESTIGATION.

PAGE 195

I. Necessary harmony of Scripture and Science.

Conflict between the two, the result of a *prejudicium*.

Prejudice against science :

Necessity of science to the Christian Advocate.

Prejudice against Scripture :

Causeless and conjectural : *e.g.*,

II. Abortive character of the attempts, on scientific grounds, to impugn Scripture.

Philological : (Sir W. Jones.)

Chronological : (Laplace, Champollion.)

The Zodiacs at Denderah ; Esneh ; Thebes.

Development Theory } Nebular Theory } Theory of Creation by Law.

These Theories are opposed to admitted facts,

Especially the facts of Geology : attested by

Sir R. Murchison, Prof. Sedgwick, Hugh Miller,

Alcide d'Orbigny.

Another Theory of this kind is that of

III. The High Antiquity of the Human Race.

This Theory—as far as it professes to be based on the discoveries of geology—is remarkable not only as being the latest novelty; but also, as being directly opposed to all previous geological teaching.

It is based, however

1. On certain suppositions as to the time required for the formation of peat, and the accumulation of shell mounds.
2. On the periods assigned to the ages of bronze, iron, and stone.
3. On the time supposed to be required for the formation of the deltas of the Mississippi and the Nile.
4. On certain fossilized human remains, especially “those found by Schmerling.”
5. And chiefly : On the Flint-implements found in the valley of the Somme.

But 1. The suppositions here relied upon as to the growth of peat, (a.) are at variance with the previous statements of their propounder; and
 (b.) are inconsistent with facts cited by himself: (*E.g.*, The boat load of bricks found in the *lowest* tier of the peat in the valley of the Somme.)

2. The dates assigned to the ages of bronze, iron, and stone
 - (a.) Do not sustain the assertions of High Antiquity.
 - (b.) They rest on unproved assumptions.
 - (c.) They are grossly exaggerated (see Worsaae). And
 - (d.) They have been exploded by facts. (*E.g.*, The Glasgow canoe, with the cork plug.)
 - (e.) Dr. Wilson's account of the matter, the true one.
 - α . These various implements denote—not different ages in the history of the world, but—different stages in the progress of civilization. For
 - β . In some countries “the stone period” has not even yet come to an end.
3. As to the age of the delta of the Nile, the conjectural character of these calculations is admitted by Sir C. Lyell himself; and as to that of the Mississippi, it is shown by such geologists as Dolomieu, Cuvier, Elie de Beaumont, and Dana.
4. Sir C. Lyell agrees with Dr. Schmerling that the relics found in the Liége caverns had been washed into those caverns, through fissures, probably by some great flood.
5. The discovery of the Flint-implements does not sustain the theory professedly based upon it.

Mr. Pattison's answer to Sir C. Lyell.

Hugh Miller, on Theories opposed to Facts.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE SUBJECT CONTINUED.

PAGE 219

Our opponents' admissions :

That the instances formerly adduced (to prove the truth of this theory),

And the cave evidence generally,
Are inconclusive.

Their assertion :

That in the “Flint-implements” they possess at last “the decisive facts.”

Examination of this assertion.

I. It is not proved

1. That the antiquity of the Flint-implements is as great as that of the extinct mammals: for mere association in the same deposit does not imply co-existence in time.

It is not proved

2. That the antiquity of those mammals is greater than "the prescribed 6000 years" will allow. On the contrary, the ascertainable evidence goes to prove the very opposite.

It is not proved

3. That the physical changes which the structures of those extinct mammals are supposed to imply require a longer period than the common chronology allows.

It is not proved

4. That the Diluvium is as ancient as has hitherto been supposed: And

It is not even proved

5. That the embedding deposit in which these flints are found *is* Diluvium.

But on the other hand—against this assertion—and consequently

Against the theory of the pre-Adamite antiquity of Man,

II. It is proved

1. That the sedimentary deposits in which the Flint-implements are found present phenomena utterly incompatible with the assumptions of the Uniformitarian school, on which this theory is based: And
2. That these phenomena indicate not the lapse of ages which this theory supposes, but merely such brief periods as the received chronology amply allows.

III. Further: It is shewn

That the so-called principle of "Uniformity" in geology (on which this theory depends)

1. Is opposed to experience;
2. Is unsupported by analogy;
3. Is intrinsically absurd;
4. Is admitted to be insufficient;
5. Is virtually surrendered,
6. Is condemned on the testimony of Dr. Whewell, Sir R. Murchison, and Professor Phillips.

} by Sir Chas. Lyell himself; and

CHAPTER IX.

THE SUBJECT CONCLUDED.

I. Purpose and tendency of Sir Charles Lyell's book.

PAGE 239

Conclusion of the Examination gives this Result;—

Against the chronology of Scripture,

No Probability has been established,

Nor any single proposition Proved.

II. Similar Purpose of Bunsen's Egyptology.

His strength of assertion :

His weakness of proof:

His irreconcileable inconsistency :—

1. In the selection of his authorities ;
2. In his mutilation of them,—e.g., Manetho ; Eratosthenes ; The Monumental Inscriptions.
3. In his indictment against Eusebius.

His violation of the “first principles of historical criticism.”

III. Professor Huxley's purpose : as shewn in his

“ Evidence as to Man's Place in Nature.”

His assertion “That Man is, in substance and in structure, one with the brutes.”

His belief “That even the highest faculties of feeling and of intellect begin to germinate in lower forms of life.”

His disbelief in any intervention of the First Great Cause.

Darwinism: Development: “Primordial Necessity.”

The entire theory is a mere tissue of conjecture

Opposed to the facts of Natural History.

The doctrine of spontaneous generation is condemned by Mr. Darwin himself.

Its advocates are unable to adduce one solitary fact in its favour.

The doctrine of transmutation of species is condemned by Dr. Carpenter.

The scientific evidence goes to show that “certain groups of animals, such as the Foraminifera,” *can never rise to a higher grade.*

As matter of fact, the Foraminifera have made no advance from the Palaeozoic period to the present day.

Opposed to the facts of Geology.

The “transitional forms” are nowhere to be found.

Confessions of Messrs. Darwin and Huxley on this head.

The earlier fossils are of a kind very opposite to those required by this theory.

Testimony of Hugh Miller.

Opposed to consciousness and experience.

Socially, morally, religiously, and historically,

Men and apes are utterly and generically distinct.

If this distinction arises from physiological structure,

Then Prof. Huxley's theory is overthrown.

If the distinction is not physiological,

Then man possesses an immaterial element which physiology cannot grasp.

IV. The Plurality of Races :

A degrading doctrine;

1. Directly opposed to the Darwinian theory;

Result of this opposition;

2. Founded on conjecture;

In ignorance,

And error;

3. Contradicted by the ascertained facts

Of physiology

And History.

4. Falsely assumes the exploded theory of Uniformitarianism.

V. Review of these scientific allegations :

PAGE 271

They are unscientific;

They are unsustained by proof;

They are inconsistent, illogical, and inconclusive.

It is not *such* allegations that can shake our Faith in Scripture.

Their unblushing impudence of assertion;

contrasted with

The modesty of True Science,

and further shewn in

VI. Mr. Goodwin's assault on the Mosaic Cosmogony.

1. Its immodesty;

Its irrelevance;

Its unfairness;

Its misrepresentation of geological facts.

2. Dr. Lardner's testimony:

That Genesis is in strict accordance with Geology:

3. Based upon the latest researches of Murchison and D'Orbigny.

VII. Review of the whole subject :

279

Teaches (I.) Caution and (II.) Confidence.

(I.) Caution: lest we confound Scripture with our own private interpretation.

Neglect of this caution; in relation to

1. The Mosaic Cosmogony:

Expanse—Firmament,

Dr. Pratt's version.

Peculiarity of Bible language on scientific subjects.

This peculiarity stamps it as Divine.

2. Death before the Fall.

Here again, the contradiction lies not between Science and Scripture; but only between Science and the popular interpretation of Scripture.

- a. The scientific statement

restricts "Death before the Fall" to the inferior animals alone.

Reasons for this statement :

- α. We find their fossil remains
In vast numbers
And in ten thousand species.
But no remains of man.
- β. Physiology and comparative anatomy show
that they were not cotemporaneous.
- b. The Scriptural statement
does not extend "Death by the Fall" beyond the
human race.
 - α. For it makes that death co-extensive with
sin ; and the brute creation is incapable of sin.
 - β. It is co-extensive also with the Resurrection.
 - γ. It expressly intimates that there *was* death
before the Fall.
- c. Death is a general law of all organic natures :
As essential to our system, as gravitation.
- d. Three modes of harmonizing Scripture and Science.
 - α. Death was (from the first) the general law :
and man the solitary exception to its universal
operation.
 - β. The death denounced in consequence of sin,
was not physical.
 - γ. The effect of sin—like that of the Atonement
—was not only future, but also retrospective.
Advantages of this latter method.
- 3. The Noachian Deluge
 - a. As a fact : is unquestioned,
is attested by history,
and by Geology.
 - b. But as to its extent : Was it absolutely universal ? or
only relatively so ?
Did it overwhelm the whole globe ? or only the regions
then inhabited ?
 - c. The first alternative
 - α. Is encumbered with difficulties : as to
The quantity of water,
The dimensions of the ark,
The collection and dispersion of the animals.
 - β. Involves the supposition of miracles unsup-
ported by the narrative; and
 - γ. Rests on a literality of interpretation not
justified by the usage of the sacred writers.
 - δ. Is condemned, therefore, on purely exegetical
grounds. (Poole, Stillingfleet, Pye Smith.)

<i>d.</i>	The second alternative	
	Is entirely free from difficulties ; and	
	Is perfectly consistent with the sacred narrative.	
<i>e.</i>	The conflict of opinions.	
4.	The Biblical Chronology.	
(II.)	Confidence—in the CERTAINTY of Scripture.	PAGE 297
1.	There has been no wresting of Scripture, to make it agree	
	with Science : e.g.,—	
<i>a.</i>	Death before the Fall.	
<i>b.</i>	Universality of the Deluge.	
<i>c.</i>	The age of the world.	
<i>d.</i>	The Mosaic account of the Creation.	
2.	There has been a most ridiculous failure of every attempt to	
	show that Scripture and Science are at variance.	
	Recapitulation : Huxley, Lyell, Bunsen, Horner.	
3.	The positive and uniform agreement between Scripture and	
	Science, as to	
<i>a.</i>	The vitality of the blood ;	
	Distinction between rain and dew ;	
	The atmosphere, { Its power ;	
	Its pressure ;	
	The earth, { Its form ;	
	Its sustentation ;	
	Circulation of water ;	
	Circuits of the winds ;	
	The “influence of Pleiades ;”	
	Light independent of the sun ;	
	Primeval vegetation ;	
	Common origin of birds and fishes ;	
	Number of the stars ;	
	Connection between the sun and moon ;	
	Distinction between these luminaries and their light.	
<i>b.</i>	Contrasted with the false science of	
	The Hindus,	
	The Mahometans,	
	The Egyptians,	
	The Greeks and Romans,	
	The Fathers and the Popes,	
	Montaigne, Buffon, and Voltaire.	
<i>c.</i>	Is itself a complete demonstration of the Plenary In-	
	spiration of “all Scripture.” (E.g., The Mosaic	
	Cosmogony.)	

PART III. SOPHISMS.

PAGE 315

CHAPTER X.

- I. That the dogma of an infallible Bible is on a par with that of an infallible Pope, and will soon be as utterly exploded.
- II. That Scripture and Science are at variance.
- III. That the Bible must succumb to a "remorseless criticism."
- IV. The weight which this Criticism derives from the character and position of the Critics.
- V. The force which it derives from "the combined momentum of so many minds."
- VI. But if the Divine authority of the whole Bible could be established, it would still be unworthy the enlightenment of our age to submit to the "bondage of the letter."
 1. To what then must we submit ?
 - a. To the internal oracle? (Mr. Newman.) Inaudible and unascertainable?
 - b. To conscience? (Dr. Temple.) Flexible to an indeterminate degree?
 2. Mr. Jowett's fallacy:—"Not the Book, but the truth of the Book":
 3. Refuted by Dr. R. Vaughan:—"The Letter and the Spirit."
- VII. Take care of Christianity, and let the Creeds take care of themselves. But without the Creeds, Christianity is impossible. Its cardinal condition is Faith.
- VIII. We ask for evidence, and you offer us faith. If your evidence is sufficient, why talk of faith? and if it be insufficient, on what ground do you require us to believe?
 1. The charge is untrue. Our opponents take good care not to ask for evidence.
 2. It confounds the evidence with the faith which that evidence at once inspires and justifies.
 3. The evidence of miracles alone is amply sufficient.
- IX. But a miracle is impossible.
 1. How do you know that?

The assertion is incapable of proof.
Definition of a miracle.
Fallacy of the pretence of "uniform experience."
Substitution of an experience limited and partial, for one that is uniform and universal.
 - On Mr. Hume's principle, a fact may be contrary to experience, and yet not contrary to truth!
 - But the impugners of miracles do not, after all, rely on experience: they themselves rely on testimony!

327

And yet, on pretence of a uniform experience, they shut God out of His own world; and maintain "the inconceavableness" of miracles. (Baden Powell.)

2. This assertion (thus shewn to be incapable of proof) is disproved by undeniable facts.

- a. The existence of Christianity, if not owing to the evidence afforded by physical miracles, is in itself a moral miracle.

Its success—without the means of success—is a miracle. The labours of its apostles—without a motive—is a greater miracle.

And yet there is actually no motive and no means whatever, until we admit the fact of The Resurrection of our Lord.

- b. The fact of the Resurrection is further attested by the existence (and consequent origin) of the Christian Sabbath.
- c. The fact of the Creation is similarly attested by the existence (and origin) of the Jewish, the patriarchal, and the primitive Sabbath.
- d. But each successive act of Creation is a miracle of the most stupendous kind.
- e. The creation of the first man alone involves three distinct and undeniable miracles :—
 - α. That such a being should exist at all—in spite of uniform experience;
 - β. That he should be created, although every other man has been born; and
 - γ. That in the development of his faculties, his experience should be directly contrary to that of all his descendants.

X. But after all, miracles can never command our faith.

How is it then, that they *have* commanded the faith of multitudes?

XI. "Book-revelation is impossible."

If so, then, on their own principles, the book-revelations of Lord Herbert and Mr. Newman are self-condemned.

XII. The Bible must be rejected on the ground of its incredibilities :

E.g., (i.) That God should authorize the extirpation of the Canaanites ;
 (ii.) That He should inflict eternal punishment upon the wicked.

- (i.) A. 1. It is alleged that this destruction of the Canaanites is too terrible to be true. But
- 2. The destruction of Jerusalem (for instance) involves horrors much more terrible,
 And therefore, (if the allegation be valid) much more untrue.

3. But we know it to be true :
4. And therefore, the allegation which implies the contrary is itself untrue.

B. 1. Calamities of this kind, if not untrue, are at all events too terrible to be of Divine Appointment : Consequently, the Bible which claims for them this appointment is incredible. But

2. Similar calamities are continually occurring—where Divine Appointment is unquestionable :—*E.g.*, Earthquake, Famine, Pestilence. Therefore
3. He who (on account of these difficulties) denies that God is the Author of Scripture, must also (for the very same reason) deny Him to be the Author of Nature.
4. The presence of these difficulties in the Bible, no less than in the World, is a clear indication of the common origin of both.

(ii.) A. 1. On critical grounds, it is affirmed
That the doctrine of eternal punishment is not taught in the Bible.

2. Against this affirmation however, we have these three facts :—
 - a. The words employed to teach the doctrine are the most expressive that can be found.
 - b. Their collocation intensifies their force. And
 - c. Our Lord's own interpretation of them puts their meaning beyond a doubt.

B. 1. On moral grounds, it is affirmed
That this doctrine is incompatible with the Divine Benevolence.

2. But this affirmation rests upon a false assumption.
3. All that Divine Power could do to avert the infliction of future punishment, Divine Benevolence has done.

Besides, 4. Why should that be deemed incredible in the world to come, which, in the present world, we see to be actual?

- a. As matter of actual fact, men do incur punishment in this life.
They incur this punishment of their own free choice ;
By their own act and deed ;
In defiance of warning and experience.
- b. And the punishment they thus incur
Is inevitable ; Is irremediable ; Is immitigable.

C. Lastly : Punishment is an EFFECT—whose CAUSE is SIN.

1. And yet our opponents' system takes no notice of Sin !
Exposure of Theodore Parker's sophism :
And Mr. Wilson's.

2. Can anything be more absurd than to predict the cessation of the Effect, without the removal of the Cause?
3. Are we to accept as Teachers of Morals, the men who are blind to the existence of immorality?

XIII. "To sever the false from the true, we need a 'verifying faculty': Reason must be the arbiter of Revelation."

1. Whose reason? Is every man to be his own Pope?
2. { Dr. Temple's doctrine of the Supremacy of Conscience,
 { And Theodore Parker's of the Moral Intuitions,
3. Shewn to be contrary to Scripture and to fact.

XIV. "Since Jesus was human, why should we suppose His teaching infallible?"

1. Because He was not more truly human, than he was superhuman.
2. Dr. Colenso's sophism: Examined and Refuted.

PART IV. CERTAINTY.

PAGE 355

CHAPTER XI.

IT IS CERTAIN

I. That Man needs a Religion.

1. He is "a religious animal": he *will* worship.
Whatever be the cause, the fact is unquestionable:
There is a "religious instinct" which characterizes man as man.
2. Man, by worshipping, becomes assimilated to the moral character of the object which he worships.
This fact is attested by the universal history of idolatry.
3. This process of necessary assimilation has uniformly been a process of debasement:
And from this debasement (—Christianity apart—) there are no possible means of extrication for mankind.
These three great facts demonstrate the truth of man's religious need.

IT IS CERTAIN

II. That the Christian Religion is perfectly adapted to the actual condition and necessities of mankind.

This adaptation is demonstrated in these two particulars:—

1. Christianity reveals a Pure Object of Worship.
2. It accompanies this Revelation with a bestowal of Power.

IT IS CERTAIN

III. That the OBJECTIONS alleged against the Bible, as the Divine Revelation containing that Religion, ARE UNTENABLE.

It is objected

1. That the Bible abounds with Difficulties.

But *a.* So does everything in the world: e.g.,
 The transformations of matter,
 The operations of mind,
 The moral condition of the human race.

b. The presence of these Difficulties in the Bible, not less than in the World, is a strong reason for believing in the common origin of both.

c. None of these Difficulties are peculiar to the Bible.
 The Bible did not create them; but it does diminish them.

d. But even were it otherwise, the objection would still be absurd. For
 It sets up the pretensions of ignorance against the authority of knowledge.
 It makes that which we do know depend on that which we do not know.
 It would make us doubt whether we know anything, because forsooth, we do not know everything.

2. And Contradictions. No doubt it does:

But *a.* The contradictions found in the Bible are such only as are found in all true histories;

b. Such as were never found in any false history whatever;

c. Such, and such only as serve to give the strongest corroboration of its truth.

d. None of them are irreconcilable.

e. They arise from omission: not from opposition.
 Each account is true as far as it goes.

f. It is certain that if the Bible histories had been fictitious, these contradictions would not have been there.

3. That it is of double meaning and doubtful interpretation.

But *a.* So are Shakspeare and Dante.

b. This liability is a condition of excellence.

c. Urged in a bad sense, the objection is not true.

d. Where the meaning is double the interpretation is not doubtful.

E.g., Prof. Jowett on Ho. xi. 1.

4. That it is incompatible with the truths of Science.

But it is certain

a. That in no single instance has this charge ever yet been proved.

b. That between the statements of the Bible and the established facts of Science there exists a substantial agreement, so extensive and so minute as to furnish one of the strongest reasons for believing that the Author of Nature and the Author of Scripture are One.

- c. This agreement is the more evident and striking when viewed in contrast to the scientific teaching of all false religions.
- d. The language of the Bible on scientific (as also on prophetic) subjects is germinant; and is so framed as to adapt itself to the successive advances of scientific discovery.

IT IS CERTAIN

IV. That THE REASONS assigned for a belief in the Divine Authority of the Bible ARE UNANSWERABLE.

363

- 1. The history of the Bible is a history without a parallel.
 - a. No Book has incurred hostility so deadly, so determined,—none has had enemies so numerous or so powerful—as the Bible.
 - b. Yet—by some mysterious power—the Bible has triumphed over all.
 - c. It exists to-day—in more than two hundred languages—and is read throughout the world.
 - d. It exists uncorrupted and unaltered; in a state of purity not attained by any other writing of antiquity.
- e. In this

Existence, notwithstanding the mightiest efforts for its extirpation;
 Dispersion, itself a fact beyond all human parallel; and
 Unrivalled purity of preservation: we see the Finger of God.
- f. In this interposition of a Divine Power we recognize the warrant of a Divine Authority.
- g. Let those who deny the one or the other, make good the denial by the production of natural causes ADEQUATE to the production of the actual effect; or else—Let them admit that
- h. The history of the Bible—attested as it is by the existence of the Bible—is a phenomenon Supernatural and Divine.

2. The Bible is without a rival in the characteristic features of its Contents.

- a. As to the Writers, we have the greatest diversity in station, natural ability, mental habitudes, and literary acquisition.
- b. As to the Writings, we have the most perfect unity amid the widest variety.
- c. These Writings are characterized By Truth. Proofs and illustrations: From Moses—The Evangelists—The Apostles.
- d. By Love. Love is made the sum of human duty; and the only sufficient motive.

- e. By Holiness. God is represented as essentially holy; and as requiring emphatically a "holy worship."
- f. And by a supreme regard for the glory of God.
- g. In all these particulars the Bible is a Book *sui generis*.
- 3. The Prophecies of the Bible prove it to be divine.
 - a. They are in the strictest sense, true predictions.
 - b. They foretell the most improbable, and frequently (as it seemed) the most impossible events.
 - c. They have been most exactly and literally fulfilled.
 - d. In respect to their extent, their variety, their unity, they are unique.
 - e. They are so in respect to the grandeur of their object, and the dignity of the Person to whom they chiefly relate.
 - f. Finally, they possess a moral and instructive element inseparable from the predictive; and by this inseparability the "oracles of God" are distinguished from all other oracles whatever.
- 4. The divinity of the Bible is demonstrated by its Moral Effects alone.

General enumeration of these effects.

Can the Effect transcend its Cause?

CHAPTER XII.

IT IS CERTAIN: THAT IF THE BIBLE BE NOT DIVINE, THEN IT IS AN EFFECT WITHOUT A CAUSE.

380

I. First Proof: From the Institutes of Moses.

- 1. The work accomplished by Moses has been accomplished but once in the history of the world.
- 2. The singularity of his enactments, and of the principles on which those enactments were based, is rivalled only by their singular success.

The source of their superiority is to be found in their peculiarity. This is true of the Ceremonial and Civil Law. But

- 3. It is in The Moral Law that this perfection and peculiarity most manifestly appear.
 - a. In the principles it inculcates, in the practices which it enjoins, in its distinctness, its completeness, its brevity, its intelligibility, its demand for spiritual worship, and for the regulation of the heart,
 - b. This Law is a distinctive characteristic of the Bible: it is peculiar to the Bible alone.
 - c. It is absolutely incapable of improvement. It is based on principles, and it deals with relations that are unchangeable.

- d. Issued in a remote, a barbarous, and a superstitious age, it still presents an embodiment of wisdom unrivaled; and to this hour
- e. It constitutes the acknowledged basis of all wise and efficient legislation.
- f. Whence came it?—if not from “The Finger of God?”

II. Second Proof: From the Epistles of Paul.

1. The Moral phenomenon presented by
 - a. The Writings,
 - b. The Writer.
2. The Literary phenomenon:

Prof. Newman’s testimony to “THE UNAPPROACHABLE GREATNESS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.”

III. Third Proof: From the fossilized facts of Christianity.

Given: The writings of Philo on the one hand, and “The Shepherd” of Hermas on the other, to account for the interjection of St. John’s Gospel and St. Paul’s Epistles between them.

IV. Fourth Proof: From the admissions of our opponents.

E.g., Theodore Parker.

CHAPTER XIII.

IT IS CERTAIN: THAT THE LIFE OF CHRIST ALONE IS SUFFICIENT TO DEMONSTRATE THE TRUTH OF CHRISTIANITY.

394

Christ’s Teaching was unlike all other teaching.

His Miracles were unlike all other miracles.

But His Life was the greatest miracle of all.

- I. 1. The Man Christ Jesus was absolutely perfect.
2. No other man ever was.
3. No other man ever pretended to be.
4. Historical attestations of the fact.

II. But on any other than Christian principles this fact (always undeniably) is perfectly unaccountable.

On Christian principles the explanation is clear, consistent, and conclusive.

III. Jesus Christ is GOD MANIFEST IN THE FLESH: the visible moral embodiment of an invisible moral Deity.

Analogy between physical, intellectual, and moral manifestations of God.

IV. Jesus Christ is THE GREAT EXEMPLAR: “Leaving us an example.”

1. Philosophical necessity for this.
2. The necessity has been met.

V. The Result: GOD HATH SPOKEN TO US BY HIS SON.

CHAPTER XIV.

IT IS CERTAIN: THAT THE TESTIMONY OF CHRIST TO THE TRUTH OF CHRISTIANITY RECEIVES IRRESISTIBLE FORCE FROM THE PERFECTION OF HIS CHARACTER.

PAGE 402

- I. 1. The fact that Christ did work miracles is admitted
 - a. By the early adversaries of Christianity (Celsus, Porphyry, Julian.)
 - b. By both the earlier and later Jews.
2. It is further established by the numbers and constancy of the early Christians.
 - a. Important testimony of Tacitus.
 - b. Force of the evidence of Christ's cotemporaries.
- II. Christ's own testimony to the fact.
Opposed to this testimony there are but two suppositions possible :
 1. Was it mistaken ?
 2. Was it false ?
 Both suppositions untenable.
- III. 1. Christ could not be mistaken :
Proofs of His intellectual character.
2. He was incapable of deceit :
Proofs of His moral character.
- IV. The force of Christ's Testimony is augmented
 1. By the utter failure of every sceptical hypothesis to account for the facts. (Fichte, Carlyle, Renan.)
 2. By the admissions of sceptics themselves. (Rousseau, Theodore Parker.)

CHAPTER XV.

IT IS CERTAIN: THAT THE OLD ARGUMENTS IN PROOF OF THE TRUTH OF CHRISTIANITY ARE NOT ANTIQUATED. THEY STILL REMAIN UNANSWERED.

419

- I. 1. It is certain that the writers of the Bible were not bad men.
2. But being good men, they were true.
3. But they claimed to be Divinely Inspired:
Therefore—They *were* divinely inspired.
4. No escape from this dilemma :—
The Bible is either of Divine Inspiration or of human invention.
But good men could not falsely lay claim to an Authority they did not possess ;
And bad men could not, by any conceivable possibility, have produced a Book of superhuman excellence ;
The Bible therefore is not of man, but of God.

II. The conduct of the writers demonstrates the divinity of the mission.

E.g., 1. MOSES.

If he was not a divinely inspired messenger, he was a mendacious and cruel impostor.

But his disinterestedness proved his sincerity.

An impostor never forgets *himself*:

But Moses forgot himself to the last.

2. PAUL.

A sanguinary zealot; and yet

The writer of the thirteenth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians.

His sound judgment.

His freedom from enthusiasm.

His idea of a universal religion.

His labours; his sufferings; his aims.

Was falsehood ever attested by evidence like his? Never!

III. PALEY'S GREAT ARGUMENT IS STILL UNANSWERED :

Though often disparaged and reviled.

1. His demonstration is admitted, by our opponents themselves, to be "perfect."
2. He adduces "uncontested and incontestable" facts; which are "without a parallel."
3. These facts "cannot be accounted for" except by admitting the Truth of Christianity.
4. He establishes the authenticity of the Christian Scriptures;
5. And characteristically distinguishes the Christian Miracles from all other miracles whatsoever.

The force of the argument is to this hour unimpaired.

IV. BISHOP BUTLER'S ARGUMENT ALSO IS STILL UNANSWERED AND—UNANSWERABLE.

Our opponents' dislike of it.

By this argument, it is shewn

1. That the doctrine of a future life must be admitted even on the evidence of Reason alone.
2. That as a plain matter of fact we *are* now under God's Government.
3. That the facts of every-day life "are such as to answer *fully*" all objections to the doctrine of future Rewards and Punishments.
4. That God's Government is Moral.

That our present state is one of Moral Discipline, or Trial;

That the very idea of Necessity or Fatalism is plainly opposed to universal fact.

5. That Revelation is
 - a. An *Authoritative* republication of Natural Religion.
 - b. A revealing of things undiscoverable by Reason.

6. That all presumptions against miracles are untenable.
- That the objections urged against "The Scheme" of Christianity as well as those against its Evidence, } ARE FRIVOLOUS.
7. That Christianity rests on "PLAIN HISTORICAL FACTS WHICH CANNOT BE SET ASIDE;"

On "EVIDENCE MORE THAN HUMAN":

Hence "THE ABSURDITY OF ALL ATTEMPTS TO PROVE CHRISTIANITY FALSE."

V. LESLIE'S DEMONSTRATION of the Truth of Christianity is STILL UNANSWERED, AND UNANSWERABLE.

This argument is particularly plain and simple.
It consists

1. In laying down such marks as to the truth of matters of fact in general, that where they all meet, such matters of fact cannot be false; and then
2. In shewing that they all do meet in the matters of fact of Moses, and of Christ; and do not meet in those reported of Mohammed, or of the heathen deities, nor can possibly meet in any imposture whatsoever.

These infallible marks of truth are four: and

3. To these are added four more; three of which are peculiar to the Christian Religion alone.
4. The Result is, that

"WE CANNOT IMAGINE THE POSSIBILITY OF A MORE PERFECT OR ABUNDANT DEMONSTRATION."

CHAPTER XVI.

IT IS CERTAIN: THAT THE MOST RECENT, SUBTLE, AND POWERFUL ASSAULTS ON THE BIBLE HAVE UTTERLY FAILED TO SHAKE THE FOUNDATIONS OF OUR FAITH.

435

- I. Essays and Reviews.
 1. Their most distinguished Apologist admits that Their Assertions "are assumed as certain, without a word of proof;" and some of them even "wholly unsupported by argument."
 2. A fresh triumph for Christianity in the unanswerable arguments of the Replies.
- II. Dr. Colenso's productions.

Character of the Answers.
Dr. Mc. Caul, Mr. Birks, The Bishop of Ely.
Variety and completeness of these answers.
The positive evidence irrefragable.
Demolition of Dr. Colenso's argument on the Elohistic and Jehovahistic Psalms.

III. Renan's "Vie de Jesus" is a *reductio ad absurdum*.

The utter failure of the argument is

A further proof that *Christianity cannot but be true*.

IV. 1. "The Origin of Species," "The Antiquity of Man," "Man's Place in Nature,"

With all their unquestionable ability

Have failed to point out one solitary indisputable fact at variance with the Bible.

2. Science has its own proper certainty.

But The Speculations which (in the name of Science) are arrayed against the Bible, are a mere tissue of uncertainties. *E.g.*,

3. The supposed discovery at Jarrow.

Computations of the period required for the cooling of the earth's crust.

4. Prof. Phillips on the defectiveness of the data required for these computations.

The "abuse of arithmetic."

The *Times* on Sir C. Lyell's inaugural address.

"Scientific dogmatism."

"It is vain to deny that many so-called 'results' of geology are hypothetical:—hypothetical in that sense in which Newton protested against hypotheses."

CHAPTER XVII.

IT IS CERTAIN: THAT AGAINST THE EVIDENCE FOR CHRISTIANITY—CUMULATIVE AND CONGRUOUS AS IT IS—OUR OPPONENTS ARE UNABLE TO MAINTAIN ANY SINGLE ARGUMENT WHATEVER.

445

The two elements of a vigorous faith.

Review of the principal points of the argument.

IT IS CERTAIN

I. That the "inner principle" is insufficient for human need.

II. That an "outer Law" is necessary.

III. That this outer Law must be attested by miracles.

IV. That the Bible is such a Law; and has been so attested.

V. That it is now substantially and essentially the same as when first given.

VI. That—apart from the Bible—nothing is more true than the great facts of Christianity.

VII. That of those facts the Bible supplies the only possible explanation.

VIII. That the actual connexion between the Facts and the Sacred Books in which they are recorded is such as to stamp the latter with the Authority of a Divine Inspiration.

IX. That the cumulative evidence which demonstrates the Truth of Christianity is still further strengthened by the Force of Congruity: And

X. That of this evidence, thus varied and comprehensive, thus congruous and cumulative, our opponents are unable to rebut or to refute one single particle.

1. Modern Infidelity "does not reason," "it dreams and it dogmatizes."
2. It proves nothing. It only "objects."
3. But to the standard works in defence of Christianity "NO INFIDEL HAS EVEN PROFERRED TO WRITE AN ANSWER."
4. There is no point brought forward by infidel writers that has not been met by their opponents.
5. The Idealist attempts to evade the force of actual facts by raising abstract questions.
6. There is no infidel theory whatever which can either get rid of, or account for,
 - a. Christ's Resurrection.
 - b. Christ's Life and Character.
 - c. The character, conduct, and writings of the Apostles.
7. The various Rationalist theories of the Gospels are mutually destructive.
8. Return to the theory of Fraud.
9. Return to the Mythical theory.
10. The utter failure of these theories, a signal triumph for the Truth.

CHAPTER XVIII.

IT IS CERTAIN: THAT THE CERTAINTY WHICH CHARACTERIZES THE DEMONSTRATION OF THE TRUTH OF CHRISTIANITY, IS CERTAINTY OF THE HIGHEST KIND.

PAGE 460

- I. What *is* the highest kind of Certainty ?
 1. Unphilosophical depreciation of different kinds of evidence. Absurdity of Des Cartes' attempt to substitute demonstration for consciousness. Similar absurdity of objecting to moral truths because they are incapable of mathematical demonstration. Mathematical demonstration not more certain than Consciousness; or than The evidence of the senses. "Probable evidence" not uncertain. Probability the very guide of life.
 2. Evidence of a Divine Revelation must be not inconsistent with certain conditions. Moral subjects can admit of no evidence incompatible with human responsibility.

To object that Christianity has no certainty, because it has not mathematical certainty, is equivalent to saying that it cannot be true because it lacks the evidence which would deprive men of the liberty of rejecting it.

II. What is it that we want to know ?

1. The end of our existence.
- Our relation to The Infinite.
- The conditions of future happiness.
2. Impotence of Reason, Science, Naturalism.
- Naturalism is *against nature*.
- Count de Gasparin : Julius Müller.
3. Perfect adaptation of the Bible to human need.
- Recurrence of the great question—Is it TRUE ?

III. What is the Certainty which the Bible gives ?

1. Its facts are certain.
2. Its doctrines are certain.
3. There is a certain corroboration of its history.
4. There is a certain demonstration of its theory.
5. The Religion of the Bible is distinguished by its Certainty, from all other religions whatsoever.

The religions of Paganism never pretended to be true.

But Christianity is distinguished

By the force of the evidence in its favour ; and

By the fact of its appeal to evidence.

It appeals

- To the evidence of Miracles.
- To the evidence of Prophecy.
- To the Moral Fitness of its Doctrines, and the moral Excellence of its Precepts.
- To the Moral Character of its Penmen and Preachers.
- To the attestations of external history, and internal coincidence.
- To the UNDENIABLE FACTS WHICH PROVE THAT IT CANNOT BUT BE TRUE.
- How came the Bible to be written ? and that too by Jews ?
- How came it to be believed ?
- Force of the evidence furnished by the fact of this belief.
- Mutual relation, and perfect Unity of the Old and New Testaments.
- “Unapproachable greatness of the New Testament.”
- Life and character of Christ.
- Success of Christianity.

The COMBINATION of these facts—the CONGRUITY of this varied evidence—furnishes

ABSOLUTE MORAL CERTAINTY that the Bible is from God.

But most conclusive of all, is

6. The Experimental Certainty.

This never fails. "He that believeth hath the witness in himself."

IV. But if the evidence is thus overwhelming, how can it fail to produce universal conviction?

1. Because its fails to secure a fair examination.

Unbelief springs from Moral Causes.

2. And whatever be the causes of unbelief, want of evidence is not one of them:

For the wildest Credulities of Scepticism rest on no evidence whatever.

E.g., Lord Herbert of Cherbury: Modern "Spiritualism."

3. PUNITIVE DEBILITY of Unbelief.

CONCLUSION.

PAGE 484

I. 1. No Unbeliever can prove the Christian Religion to be false.

None can deny that it may possibly be true.

But this bare "possibility" involves consequences which no prudent man would risk.

2. Even those who refuse to admit the demonstration of its Certainty,

Are unable to put aside the proofs of its high "probability."

But this probability alone, is such that to neglect it, is to be Inexcusable, and self-condemned.

II. The Believer, perplexed with Difficulties and harassed with Doubts, will remember that

1. Critical Differences do not touch the foundations of our Faith —cannot alter the great facts on which the Christian Doctrines rest.

2. Moral Difficulties belong not to us.

The Bible does not create them: it accounts for them.

Christianity reveals the KNOWLEDGE of "A JUST GOD AND A SAVIOUR."

3. Doubts will be deprived of all their force, by a thorough knowledge of "The Evidences."

The possibility of Doubt is a necessary part of our Moral Discipline.

The recurrence of doubt will be prevented by the growth of piety.

III. THE RELIGION OF CHRIST IS TRUE: THEN IT IS TREMENDOUSLY TRUE.

APPENDIX.

489

Note A. The Reputed Traces of Primeval Man. 225

Note B. Dr. Prichard's "Researches into the Physical History of Mankind." 270

Note C. Prof. Gauissen, On Scripture and Science. 311

Note D. Isaac Taylor, On "The Atonement." 467

PART I.
DIFFICULTIES.

CHRISTIAN CERTAINTY.

CHAPTER I.

“From hence it appears that our reason may oblige us to believe some things which it is not possible for us to comprehend.”—Bp. STILLINGFLEET.¹

THE inherent difficulties of the Bible are of two kinds, and may conveniently be designated integral or incidental. By the former we shall understand all those difficulties which are inseparable from the matter of Divine Revelation ; while the latter will denote those arising from the manner in which the revelation has been made. The one class springs inherently from the Divine nature of the message ; the other is incidental to the human mode of transmission.

We begin with the first of these ; and here also two points present themselves : the lesson and the learner.

The difficulties of the lesson are axiomatic. For it contains the teachings of the Infinite, addressed to the finite. And it is not more impossible for the part to be greater than the whole, than it is for the part to comprehend the whole. “God is a Spirit.” Yes : but who shall tell us what a spirit is ? How little do we know of spiritual existence ! of its nature, of its mode ! So indistinct and undefined are our ideas, that almost the only thing on this subject which we can safely say we know, is this ; that we know nothing. Our ideas are all negative. They extend, not to what spirit is ; only to what it is not. It is not matter. It is imponderable, impalpable, and indivisible. It has neither form nor color. But if to these merely negative ideas, we add ideas positive ; if for the abstract we substitute the concrete ; if instead of curious speculations on spiritual

¹ Enchiridion Theologicum, vol. i. p. 390.

existence in general as a possible phenomenon, we rise to the serious contemplation of One Supreme Spirit, as an actual fact, how are our difficulties increased! To be everywhere, yet everywhere invisible; to be at the same time diffused and concentrated, and both infinitely; to be not a mere abstraction, but a real Person; to comprehend infinity; to exist in the uncommenced duration which is past, and in the unending duration which is yet to come, and in both to be The Everlasting One: this is to be God; but how it baffles our poor conceptions!

Yet this is but the beginning. God is infinitely good: Whence then came evil? He is infinitely strong, and "His work is perfect:" Why then did he suffer the success of the destroyer? It is the natural question of the untutored savage, "Why not God kill debble?" Nay more: go back from the fall of Adam to the fall of Lucifer, and say, What was the primal origin of Evil? Did not the Allwise foreknow it? Could not the Almighty prevent it? Or are we ruled by Fate? True, it seems as if we were free; but how can human freedom consist with Divine foreknowledge? Such are some of the difficulties which meet us at the very threshold of the subject. I do not say they are insoluble; far from it: I believe the contrary. But they are serious, and they are inseparable from the lesson which Revelation teaches.

There are others which are inseparable from the limited capacity of the learner. To a little child, his father's watch is an object of unbounded admiration and wonder. He sees the hands go round, but cannot imagine why; he hears the ceaseless ticking, but cannot tell whence it comes. And yet, however complicated its movements, there is no mystery in the watch. The whole mystery, such as it is—and to the child it appears unfathomable—springs from his own ignorance. And that ignorance is, for the time, necessary. It is the condition of childhood. While he is a child, he will continue to think as a child; and with his childish thoughts the most perfect explanations are thrown away. The difficulty is not in the lesson, but in the learner; yet while that learner's capacity remains within the limits of childhood, the difficulty is insurmountable.

The case is precisely our own. In our relation to the high mysteries of Revelation, we are all children. In themselves they contain nothing inconsistent with the highest reason; nothing incompatible with the highest goodness. But for us, such knowledge is too high; it is wonderful; we cannot attain unto it. We are beset not merely with the ignorance, but also with the incapacity of childhood. We are surrounded with the most conclusive demonstrations that the lesson is true; we are as thoroughly assured by "many infallible proofs" as was he of old, that ours is, "a Teacher come from God;" and yet like him we ask, "How can these things be?"

But this is not all. Our intellectual capacity is not only limited, it is little. To be limited is a necessary condition of every created being; and the distance between the highest archangel before the throne of God and that God himself, must still be measured by the distance between the finite and the infinite. Every rank of those high intelligencies which stand between ourselves and the highest state of created being, is the subject, not less than ourselves, of a capacity that can never transcend an absolute limit; yet how incomparably does that limit transcend our own! How puny are our ultimate achievements beside their primal intuitions! From the child among his toys to the statesman swaying the destinies of unborn millions—from the Polynesian savage who believed the missionary's watch to be God Almighty, to the philosopher of Grantham unfolding the system of the universe—the distance is great indeed; yet it dwindles to a point when compared with the distance between our highest intellects and the lowest of angelic beings. What must it appear if we could scale those countless heights beyond which the cherubim stand before the throne of the Most High! Yet even there we should find devout and reverential learners of the great lesson of Revelation. Its mysteries are sublimities which the highest "angels desire to look into." And if, compared with the magnitude of those mysteries, even angelic minds are conscious of puny inadequacy, what self-distrust and self-abasement should be ours! Alas! we are of yesterday, and know nothing. Baffled as we are by the mysterious secrets of the life that now is, how should we be able to penetrate the hidden mysteries of the life that is to come? If we have

failed to understand when told of earthly things, how shall we hope to comprehend the nature of heavenly things? The greatest discoveries of earth are but as pebbles on the strand, while the great ocean of Truth, with its fathomless unknown depths lies still in majesty, sublime and unexplored. Of an archangel indeed we may conceive as not confined to the shore; but still each fresh attempt to sound those unfathomable mysteries extorts the astonished exclamation, "O the depth! O the depth!" And still for evermore as with ever-lengthened line and heavier plummet he again essays to find some boundary of the deep, he is still constrained to cry, "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! Thy way, O God, is in the sea, and Thy paths in the deep waters; and Thy footsteps are not known."

The conclusion is irrefragable: it should be distinctly understood and constantly remembered. The inherent difficulties of the Bible, so far from diminishing its credibility, confirm it in the highest degree. For they are such as bespeak an Author superhuman, an Intelligence Divine. The mysteries are in the nature of the things revealed; not in the revelation itself. Put the Bible entirely out of the question, and then ask yourself what is your own conception of Infinity? You will find that whether applied to Time or Space there are but two suppositions imaginable; that each of these is beset with difficulties not merely unavoidable, but inseparable from the suppositions themselves; and in short, that (although no other is possible) each of these two suppositions is equally impossible to be comprehended by the feeble intellect of man. The understanding reels in its attempt to grasp them. Endeavour to realize a distinct idea of infinite space. Let your imagination wing her airy flight until she reaches the remotest bound of that universe in which our own sun is merely a faint and insignificant star; let her traverse not merely the islets but the continents of stellar worlds, until she stands on the outer brink of all creation; what then? what is beyond? anything, or nothing? You are not more unable to tell than you are to imagine. For if you accept the first alternative you merely prolong your search for the ultimate boundary: if you would

embrace the second it eludes your grasp. To conceive of a point beyond which there is no space, no extension, is simply impossible. But to realize the opposite conception is, for us, equally impossible. And the same is true of our idea of infinite duration. Time, considered as a fragment of eternity, has its boundaries; but if eternity too has its boundaries, what is beyond the boundaries? what was before it? by what shall it be followed? The duration which always was; the duration which always will be: it is a conception we cannot comprehend, yet we can form no other. And thus the human mind is hedged in between these two, the finite and the infinite; so that it seems almost equally hard to conceive of either of them, whether as being, or as not being. And if this difficulty is thus inseparable from the nature of infinity in the abstract, how much more inseparable from the nature of Him from whom that infinity has sprung, and by whom it is sustained! He is the "God nigh at hand;" He is the God "afar off." "Do not I fill heaven and earth, saith the Lord?" Even so: "From everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God!"

"How firmly 'stablished is Thy throne!
Which shall no change nor period see;
For Thou, O Lord, and Thou alone
Art God, to all eternity."

Great indeed is the mystery of godliness. Yet to have transcended at some points the limits of human thought, is not the reproach of Scripture, but its recommendation. For listen to the voice of philosophy in its many speculations, of reason in its arduous toils, of experience recording its failures, of imagination as it folds its tired and baffled wing; and you shall hear from each and all the reiteration of that utterance of the highest Wisdom—"Canst thou by searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? It is as high as heaven; what canst thou do? deeper than hell; what canst thou know? His understanding is Infinite: there is no searching of His understanding!"

From the difficulties inherent to the matter, we now proceed to those incidental to the manner, of Divine Revelation. These though more numerous are less profound than those we have

just dismissed, and have three principal sources:—the poverty of language, the nature of translation, and the consequences of transcription. Let us glance at these in their order.

I. Difficulties arising from the poverty of language; that is to say, from the inadequacy of human words to express superhuman ideas. To utter new ideas is difficult, but when the new idea transcends the highest flight of human thought, how much more so? “How would you speak of ‘holiness,’ for instance, to a man who has no conception of holiness, or whose only notion respecting it is that of having recently bathed in a sacred stream? How would you express the Christian doctrine of ‘regeneration’ to a man who expects to be born again, either in the form of an insect or of a loathsome reptile, as a punishment for his sins, or in the form of a prince or noble, in reward for his good actions? It is only as the ideas and experience of any two nations coincide, that the words of their languages will correspond.” When a South African missionary² wished to tell a party of chiefs that he had made a three months’ voyage from England, and had since travelled six weeks in his wagon from Cape Town to visit them, he had no difficulty in relating to them the latter fact, for they saw his wagon, and the oxen that had drawn it: but how was he to speak of the sea and ships to men to whom ships and the sea were unknown? He was obliged to impress into his service such ideas as they had. He said that before he travelled six weeks in the wagon, he had had to cross a large pond; so large, that it took him three moons to come over, which he did in a house built in a large bowl, which had wings; that there were many men with him in the house, who spread out the wings to catch the wind, all day and all night, while others guided the great bowl. No wonder that he overheard them whispering, “He thinks we are such fools as to believe him.” Yet this singular account of a voyage across the Atlantic *came as near to the truth as the language of that people admitted.*

And precisely the same thing may be said of that Anthropomorphism which abounds in the Scriptures, and in which some persons have found a difficulty. It is a necessity which

² Campbell.

arises from the nature of the case. The same authority that declares "God is a Spirit;" declares also and with equal plainness,³ "God is not a man." That He is said to repent, to be angry, to be "a man of war," or even to be the most august of monarchs seated on His throne, all this is the language of accommodation to the crassitude of our ideas and the narrow range of our vocabulary. That it is chargeable with a certain literal inaccuracy we do not pretend to deny; but then this inaccuracy is only of that kind from which no writings on kindred topics can possibly be free.

The philosophizing objector who finds fault with the humanized and limited ideas which pervade the anthropomorphism of the Scriptures, must be reminded that even the most abstract representations which the mind can form amount in reality to no more than to a mere assemblage of *material* perceptions of the most palpable nature. His attention must be recalled to the well-known truth that all the restrictions of materialism do in fact adhere to the most spiritual conceptions attainable by mankind; that the philosopher's most incoporeal ideas, as he deems them, are, after all, inextricably invested with the earthliness and anthropomorphism to which he aspires to be superior. He must remember that all language consists, when reduced to its elements, of the signs of sensible ideas only, and hence that a revelation conveyed in the most abstract language possible must still partake of the characteristics which cause his discontent with the style of Scripture. Let such an objector draw out his religious creed in the language best suited to his own conceptions, and to the eye of the accomplished etymologist it shall present nothing more than so many signs of sensible objects of the most homely and tangible description.⁴ How unfounded then is the fastidiousness which would banish the material from the language which

³ Nu. xxiii. 19: 1 Sa. xv. 29.

⁴ "Perhaps a more abstract idea can scarcely be selected than that conveyed by the common affix *ness* to our English words, as the exponent of a condition or quality, in such words as goodness,

whiteness, &c.; and yet a celebrated etymologist finds its origin in nothing more abstract than the French word *nez*, whence comes the English word *nose*. Even the word *idea* itself involves an obvious reference to the use of the eye."

it would deem the most suitable vehicle for a revelation ! If it be a fault that the Scriptures speak by sensible images, it is a fault with which the writings of the most transcendental metaphysician are also chargeable.

II. But this difficulty—the difficulty which the poverty of language renders inevitable—is closely followed by another ; and the two though intimately connected are yet perfectly distinct. The first pertains to the original language of revelation, the second to every translation. Passing over those versions and passages of versions which are notoriously faulty,⁵ and taking our examples from that “noble version”⁶ which by the admission of its foes⁷ is probably the best in the world, in how many instances shall we yet find it impossible to produce a translation which shall reproduce the ideas inseparably associated with the original ! When the missionaries in the South Sea Islands first introduced the horse, the natives immediately called it “the pig that carries the man.” The reason was evident : they had pigs in abundance, but no sheep or cattle of any kind, and thus they were driven to associate the idea of a horse with that of a pig or a rat, the largest quadrupeds known to them. And however we may smile at so cumbrous a periphrasis, we must remember that it was perfectly natural.⁸ Our own derivation of “telegram” was not more so. Yet what an impassable chasm did such a designation interpose between their own ideas and those of the Celts who gave us the “Ros” from which by metathesis and the addition of the aspirate we have obtained “horse !” In the translation of the Scriptures there has been, fortunately for us, an operation of special causes tending greatly to diminish both the number and extent of these chasms ; yet though thus modified they could not possibly be avoided. Take a single instance ; and that it may be the more significant let it be

⁵ Such as the Romish, the Socinian, and the “Amended !”

⁶ So the Popish Dr. Doyle calls it.

⁷ The Papists. Their unwilling tribute to the unrivalled excellence of our Authorized Version appears unmistakeably in the fact that each

succeeding edition of their own (Douay) Bible is a closer approximation to our own.

⁸ Compare (much nearer home) the German usage—“hand-shoe,” for “glove ;” and “water-stuff-gas,” for “hydrogen.”

taken from a passage in which the beauty and force of the translation fairly rivals the original. Instead of the two words "earnest expectation" in Ro. viii. 19, St. Paul uses a single word which signifies "to keep an eager look out," "to watch attentively with the head bent forward ;" a word which suggests the idea of a man who, with outstretched neck, looks and waits with impatient longing for the arrival of some beloved and expected friend. To one who perceives the just force of our word *alert*⁹ it might seem more expressive to say that mankind, or the creature (in St. Paul's sense) stands *on the alert* in earnest expectation. Still, the Authorized Version of the passage is one which could hardly gain by any alteration. It would not be strange if we found ourselves more prolix even while endeavouring to be more precise. And yet excellent for its terseness and force as is "earnest expectation" it falls far short of the "lively hope and vehement longing" expressed by the original word.

This non-retention of the ideas of the original is the frequent cause of much obscurity in the translation ; and this obscurity again sometimes produces considerable perplexity and difficulty. Our Authorized Version is, I repeat it, unrivalled, and yet so impossible is it in the best translation to avoid those difficulties which are inseparable from all translations, that there is no exaggeration in the words of a competent writer¹⁰ who affirms that "The man who can read, and does read, and is familiar with the original Greek of the New Testament, is a totally different man, as to the divine life of knowledge, from him who can only read, or does only read, his English New Testament." In another place the same writer adds, "I believe it utterly impossible to give an English reader anything like an accurate idea of the argument of the Epistle to the Romans. Among the hundreds of thousands who read that glorious Epistle in their English Bibles, and gain spiritual life and edification from it, there is not one who can read it as intelligently as the poorest and meanest of those to whom it was first written."

⁹ As derived through the Italian *all'erta*, from the Latin *ad erectam*, and signifying "to be on a raised

place ; a place favorable for seeing and watching."

¹⁰ Dean Alford.

III. Once more. To the difficulties of translation must be added all those resulting from the inaccuracies of transcription. The frequency and gravity of these inaccuracies of the copyists may be estimated by observing the modern errors of the press. It is not all of these that are as harmless as that typographical blunder by which only a few days ago the (once) United States of America were designated the Untied States. How solemn and appropriate is that petition in the Burial Service—"O Lord God most holy, O Lord most mighty, O holy and most merciful Saviour, deliver us not into the bitter pains of eternal death!" How differently it reads when you have (accidentally of course) omitted that little word "not!" Yet this is but a specimen of the omissions in a book magnificently printed and lately published. That the Bible should be absolutely free from such inaccuracies of transcriptions, was not to be expected: their actual extent and importance will be noticed hereafter; at present it is sufficient to point out that they exist.

In the book of Judges (i. 19.) we read "the LORD was with Judah; and he drove out the inhabitants of the mountain, but could not drive out the inhabitants of the valley, because they had chariots of iron." Voltaire scoffs at this, as though it represented Jehovah, and not Judah as being baffled by the chariots of iron. Now-a-days, it will be perhaps impossible, among Voltaire's most enthusiastic admirers, to find one who is not ashamed of it as a contemptible cavil. But the frivolity of such objections made by the most acute of infidels, shows how hatred of the truth blinds the mind to the perception of it.

The relevancy of this reference to Voltaire will appear as soon as the true character of "Rationalism" is understood. A common error on this subject, and one to be noticed presently, is the supposition that the startling statements "pitchforked" into the face of an English public by Dr. Williams and his co-adjutors are the results of more profound researches and a more "remorseless criticism" than were formerly known. Nothing of the sort. *Omne ignoto pro magnifico.* If with the actual facts before us we ask, "What is Rationalism?" The answer is, It is the old English Deistic infidelity as taught by Bolingbroke, popularized by Voltaire, and moulded into a

scientific form by the learned labours of German writers during the last hundred years. This is the answer given by Staüdlin, Tholuck, Hagenback, Guericke, Hahn, and others ; this is the answer elicited by a comparison of the doctrines propounded and the objections urged in both periods ; and a most important answer it is. It reveals the true nature of what is now proposed for our acceptance, and the final results to which we must come, if we accept the first principles. The objections against the Noachian deluge, the account of the rainbow, the Mosaic age of the world, are repeated over and over again in the works of Voltaire ; not as now urged upon geological grounds, for although geology as a science then scarcely existed, yet such as it was, it was opposed by the seer of Fernay as being favorable to the Bible. The same too may be said of the supposed contradictions in the Gospels, so often urged in Rationalist commentaries, and last of all by Strauss.

To take a single instance. In the "Bible enfin Expliquée" we read "*Racach* signifies the solid, the firm, the firmament. All the ancients believed that the heavens were solid, and, since the light passed through them, they imagined them of crystal." The answer to this is that it is irrelevant. It is nothing to the purpose. Whether the ancients did really entertain such a belief or not is not the question.¹¹ The question is what is the proper meaning of a word used by a writer of the Holy Scripture. On the dogmatic assertion just quoted we join issue : we deny its correctness, and demand proof.

In Mr. Goodwin's Essay on the Mosaic Cosmogony the same point is touched, and in a similar manner. There is the same hardihood of assertion as to the meaning of the word, and the same attempt to give the assertion countenance by similar talk about current beliefs. But unfortunately for the success of these misrepresentations there is something more. There is an admission that the radical meaning of the word is—not solidity, but—expansion. An awkward admission this : but then it was undeniably the fact ; so what was to be done ? Why,

¹¹ But we do not admit the correctness of the assertion that they did. Plato, in the *Timaeus*, denotes the ethereal heaven by *τάσις*,

which (from *τάσις*) is of similar import to the Hebrew word (עִמָּךְ) used by Moses.

make the admission, and then pooh-pooh it as if it amounted to nothing. Affect to believe that the word was used by Moses in a non-natural sense, and that etymology which is accepted as a guide in all other cases must be rejected in this. And why must this exceptional course be taken? Because if it be not, it will appear only too plain that Scripture and Science are not at variance; that Moses was something very different from "the first daring speculator" imagined by Mr. Goodwin; and that however popular illusions and scientific inaccuracies may be reflected in translations and commentaries, it is still true that the original Scriptures are the words which (not "man's wisdom" but) the Holy Ghost teacheth. Such a triumph of plenary Inspiration must be disputed at all hazards, and accordingly Mr. Goodwin has stooped to stigmatize the fact he cannot deny, as a "quibble" about derivation. But when he has said his worst what has he done? Has he altered any of the facts? He has shewn his wish indeed that פְּנַסְׁתָּר did not signify an expanse; but he has quietly overlooked the fact that the best lexicographers—Parkhurst, Gesenius, Frey—are all against him. This simple fact remains: and Mr. Goodwin's wishing, and Mr. Goodwin's declaiming are alike unable to alter it. Whatever difficulty he finds he may charge upon his own misrepresentation; the word used by Moses presents no difficulty whatever.

Another difficulty of this class may be seen in that much misrepresented event "The spoiling of the Egyptians." It can hardly be denied that the amount of those valuables which the Israelites carried-up out of Egypt did not after all exceed the amount to which they were in equity entitled as the wages of a long and rigorous service. It is therefore not on this ground that the objection is based. The objector condemns not the amount of the acquisition, but the method of it. He points to the Israelites as having been divinely commanded to borrow what they had no intention to repay, and profanely pretends to believe that after this example there is no species of rougery which may not be justified as a mere "spoiling of the Egyptians." The answer is as simple as it is satisfactory. The objection rests entirely upon a misrepresentation of the words "borrowed" and "lent" used by our translators. We turn to the original Scriptures, and the misrepresentation is evident.

Nay more; it is evident to the mere English reader who will compare the translation of the same word in the original, by the same word in English as given in another place of the Authorized Version itself. When the pious Hannah dedicated her child of many prayers to the special service of the Most High, it was on her part a free gift, given without any thought or hope of being received back again, given for life. And yet this gift is called a loan. Eli calls it “the loan which is lent to the Lord;”¹² and Hannah says “*As long as he liveth* he shall be *lent* to the Lord.” Now remembering that the very same words are used in Exodus, all is clear. The “borrowed” jewels, are simply jewels “asked for;” and they were “lent” with as little hope or thought of re-payment as Hannah had when she too “lent” her most precious jewel “for life.” The truth is that “the Egyptians were urgent upon the people,” they were anxious to get rid of them at any price; and when to this it is added that “the Lord gave the people favor in the sight of the Egyptians,” it will not be wondered at that they “freely gave unto them such things as they required.”¹³

From difficulties founded on misrepresentations such as these, we pass by a natural transition to those which spring from ignorance or mistake. Such, for example, is the difficulty presented by a comparison of 1 Ki. vii. 13, with 2 Ch. ii. 13. In both of these passages Hiram’s father is said to have been

¹² 1 Sa. ii. 20. Marg. “The petition which she asked.”

¹³ It may serve to strengthen the statement in the text if we observe that while the word in question לְאַשְׁר, is used in numberless instances in the sense there given, and also in several others capable of strict definition, there are perhaps not more than two instances in the whole Bible in which it bears the meaning of our word “borrowed.” The two instances to which I refer are 2 Ki. vi. 5, and Ex. xxii. 14. (Heb. 13.)

[It may perhaps be contended that even here, the mention of “hiring” (v. 15) may affect the character of the borrowing, and if so, the “borrowing” of the Israelites will appear all the more plainly still to be “asking for their hire.” But let this pass. We build not on conjectures but on certainty.] Let us fully and candidly admit these two instances. What then? “What are they among so many?”

This word לְאַשְׁר signifies primarily “to ask.”

“a man of Tyre;” but with respect to his mother, the first says she was a widow “of the tribe of Naphtali,” while the second calls her a woman “of the daughters of Dan.”

Here apparently, we have a difficulty of the first magnitude, nothing less indeed than an absolute and final contradiction; and the many explanations of many years if they proved nothing else at least proved this—that the true explanation yet remained to be found. Now that it has been found we discover that the difficulty lay not in the Scripture history but in our ignorance of that history; and that as soon as our ignorance disappears the difficulty disappears also.

- I. To ask to give. Ex. iii. 22, xi. 2.
Jo. xv. 18, xix. 50. Ju. i. 14.
- II. To ask advice, counsel, To consult. 1 Sa. xiv. 37.
- III. To ask information, To enquire. Ge. xliv. 7. Ju. iv. 20.
- IV. To desire. De. xiv. 26.
- V. To wish. Job xxxi. 30. Jon. iv. 8.
- VI. To demand. Job xxxviii. 3, xl. 7, xlvi. 4.

Is it then very wonderful if in two or three solitary instances it should signify “To ask to lend, i.e. To borrow.” But the exceptional character of this usage appears much more strongly marked still when we come to elaborate any of the previous heads. Thus under I. “To ask to give,” are included

- To beg. Ps. cix. 10. Pr. xx. 4.
- To ask a favor. De. xviii. 16.
- To petition. 1 Ki. ii. 16, 20.
- To ask in prayer. Ps. cxxii. 6. Zech. x. 1. 1 Sa. i. 28.

Lastly, and most important of all,—when borrowing proper is spoken of, it is the invariable rule to use a totally different word, **לֹא**. (The only exceptions to this

rule being the two instances above named.) Thus e.g. in Ex. xxii. 25. (Heb. 24.) If thou lend money.

De. xxviii. 12. Thou shalt lend . . and thou shalt not borrow.

44. He shall lend to thee. Neh. v. 4. We have borrowed money.

Ps. xxxvii. 21. The wicked borroweth and payeth not again.

Pr. xxii. 7. The borrower is servant to the lender.

Is. xxiv. 2. As with the lender, so with the borrower.

Now when, in the Mosaic account of “spoiling the Egyptians,” the objector can discover this explicit word **לֹא** to borrow, instead of the word which really stands there, **לֹא** to ask, he may fairly claim a hearing. Till then however (*Græcis Kalendis*) he must be content to remain out of court, simply because he has no case. In all the ancient versions, and in every modern translation (our own excepted) the verb here used has its proper and literal meaning of *ask* or *demand*. Cf. Ps. ii. 8, (Authorized Ver.) where **לֹא** = **ask**.

For observe the facts. Four hundred years before Hiram was sent to Solomon, the Danites, straitened in their narrow boundaries in the south-west, sent out five valiant men as spies, with instructions to go through the whole country in search of a suitable spot for a new settlement. The desired spot was found in the remotest corner of the common territory: a secluded valley among the hills in the north of Naphtali, where, undisturbed by the resident tribe, a colony of Sidonians, long since detached from the mother country, followed their peaceful avocations, "quiet and secure." The prize was too tempting for the unscrupulous freebooters who, true to their prophetic character¹⁴—six hundred men fully armed—fell upon the unsuspecting, unresisting prey, burnt their city and changed its name from Laish to Dan,¹⁵ in memory at once of their ancestry and their migration. This accounts for everything. It accounts for the marriage of a Tyrian with a Jewess. For the colony at Dan was Sidonian before it was Jewish; and Sidon is identified with Tyre in the history itself.¹⁶ The Tyrians and Sidonians were people of one nation. Such a marriage therefore, instead of the strangeness which at first attaches to it, has all the naturalness which belongs to a marriage at Quebec between an English colonist and a French Canadian. Similarly, that there should be a town of Dan in Naphtali, is as natural as that there should be a town of Halifax in Nova Scotia. And thus, not only does the seeming contradiction disappear, but a minute and circumstantial corroboration of the verbal accuracy of the narrative is seen in its place. It is perfectly true that Hiram's mother was "of the tribe of Naphtali," for Laish, the place of her abode, was situated in the territory of that tribe. It is equally true that she was "a woman of the daughters of Dan," being descended from that little colony of six hundred sent forth in early times.

Sometimes the difficulty arises from our ignorance of peculiar modes of thought or peculiar and idiomatic expression. Of this kind is the difficulty which has been felt in the account of

¹⁴ Ge. xlix. 17. ¹⁵ Ju. xviii. 1-29.

¹⁶ See 1 Ki. v. 6, where Solomon sending to the king of Tyre for

a skilled workman, assigns as a reason the eminent skill of the *Sidonians*.

the crucifixion, on reading in Matt. xxvii. 44, that “The *thieves* also, which were crucified with him, cast the same in his teeth;” while in the parallel passage (Lu. xxiii. 39.) we read only that “*one* of the malefactors which were hanged railed on him.” Some, in order to avoid the discrepancy, have supposed that the two statements refer to two different points of time; and that both the thieves reviled at first (for thus they understand St. Matthew) although one of them, struck by Christ’s demeanour, afterwards desisted and repented (so that only the other is mentioned by St. Luke). This solution is not very satisfactory; partly because it is only a supposition, and partly because it assigns no reason for St. Matthew’s silence as to the subsequent conversion of the penitent thief.

But the true solution is found in a knowledge of the Hebrew idiom, by which the plural is used for the singular when it is not intended to express the *individual* distinctly.¹⁷ Thus it is written of Jephthah, that he was “buried in the *cities* of Gilead” (Ju. xii. 7.). “In *one* of the cities,” in our version, and this is the meaning, undoubtedly; but such is not the

¹⁷ Bythner’s Heb. Gram. p. 7.

And thus Musculus (in Matthaeum) writes on this verse:—“Verum non est putandum, quod vtriq; latrones hoc fuerint.” Then quoting the parallel passage from St. Luke, he adds—“Liquet igitur à Matthæo nostro pluralem numerum pro singulari positum;” and cites as a parallel case, Matt. xxvi. 8, where that indignation about the waste of the ointment is attributed to the disciples generally which St. John (xii. 4) particularizes as having been shown by Judas alone.

Augustine, who accounts for the difference in expression between Matthew and Luke on the same principle of the common use of the plural for the singular, adds, that in order to constitute a contradiction, the narratives of Mat-

thew and Mark should have had the word “both;” but in the absence of this word, there is a mere variety of expression but no contradiction. He shows that this is the ordinary usage of writers uninspired:—“quid autem usitatis, verbi gratiâ, quam ut dicat aliquis, Et rustici mihi insultant: etiam si unus insultet?” And he shews it to be the usage of Inspired Writers by citing Heb. xi. 33, 37, “stopped the mouths of lions,” where the reference is to Daniel alone; “were sawn asunder,” where the reference is to Isaiah alone; Ps. ii. 2. compared with Ac. iv. 26, where “the kings of the earth” and “the princes” are respectively represented by Herod and Pontius Pilate, singly.—“De consensu Evangelistarum,” Lib. III. cap. xvi.

Hebrew phrase. In like manner it is written of Jonah, that "he was gone down into the *sides* of the ship" (Jon. i. 5); it not being the purpose to tell specifically which side. Accordingly, in the passage before us, St. Matthew speaks of the thieves in the plural, because he would leave it uncertain which of the two it was.

Another and a similar instance is the apparent discrepancy between He. ix. 3, 4, and 1 Ki. viii. 9.; the former affirming that "after the second veil" (was) "the Tabernacle which is called the Holiest of all; which had the golden censer, and the ark of the covenant overlaid round about with gold, *wherein* was the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant:" the latter passage affirming that "there was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone." But says Bythner, the "*wherein*" does not relate to "the ark," but to the more remote antecedent, "the Tabernacle." "So that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews does not mean to say that these several matters were in the *ark*, contrary to the declaration of the Book of Kings, but only that they were in the Tabernacle; it being according to the genius of the Hebrew Grammar for the pronoun sometimes to have respect to the more distant, and not to the nearer noun."¹⁸

Now that this is no fictitious explanation invented for the occasion is abundantly evident on reference to many other passages. Thus we read in Genesis x. 12; "Resen between Nineveh and Calah: the *same* is a great city"—"the *same*" having reference to Nineveh, and not to Calah. Again in Psalm xcix. 6, 7: "*Moses* and *Aaron* among his priests, and *Samuel* among such as call upon his name," and "He spake unto *them* out of the *cloudy* pillar"—the "*them*" pertaining to Moses and Aaron, and not to Samuel. And to take but one instance more, Psalm civ. 25, 26: "So is the great and wide sea also; wherein are things creeping innumerable, both small and great beasts. There go the *ships*, and there is that *Leviathan* whom Thou hast made to take his pastime therein," i.e. not in "the *ships*," the latter, but in the "*sea*," the former antecedent.

¹⁸ Prof. Blunt: to whose "Parish Priest," and "Undesigned Coincidences," the writer cordially and —if he may be permitted to say it —even reverently, acknowledges his obligations.

CHAPTER II.

“God has placed mystery at the origin of all science and of all light, as he has placed it at the origin of all being and of all life. . . . Whatever is primitive is not tangible; whatever is generative is not visible; and **WHATEVER ILLUMINATES REMAINS OBSCURE.**”—Le Père Felix.¹

FROM the foregoing examples it is evident that the most satisfactory solutions of Scripture difficulties are to be found in Scripture itself. The Bible is its own interpreter. The first, and second, and third requirements indispensable for correct “Biblical Criticism” are—a thorough knowledge of the Bible itself. Trace, for instance, the course of those two armies whose conflict “in the wood of Ephraim” decided the fate of a dynasty. The venerable king summoning his cabinet with the words “Arise, and let us flee; for we shall not else escape from Absalom.” The hurried departing—with the few friends yet firm to a falling cause; the household troops, the Cherethites, the Pelethites, and that rare embodiment of faithful affection, Ittai the foreigner, with his six hundred Gittites. The universal weeping, as those stern warriors crossed the Kedron and wound up the sides of Mount Olivet, with covered heads and bare feet. The fierce indignation against Shimei;² and the

¹ “Le Progrès par le Christianisme.” Paris 1864.

² Not to be estimated from the single remonstrance recorded on the occasion, that of Abishai; but rather from the united remonstrance of the whole army, recorded in ch. xviii. v. 3. See also ch. xxi. v. 17, and ch. xxiii. v. 16. Such glimpses as these constrain us to apply to the loyalty of these

Hebrew warriors the glowing eulogium of Macaulay on the sepoys at Arcot under Clive. “The devotion of the little band to its chief surpassed anything that is related of the Tenth Legion of Cæsar, or of the Old Guard of Napoleon. . . . History contains no more touching instance of military fidelity, or of the influence of a commanding mind.”

narrow escape at Bahurim, which necessitated the night passage of the Jordan and the forced march on Mahanaim. Then trace the pursuers carefully following on the track until at last you find both "Israel and Absalom pitched in the land of Gilead." But how is this? Both armies have crossed the Jordan and are encamped to the east of it, where the only tribes are Reuben, Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh. Ephraim was situate in one compact territory lying altogether to the west. What then are we to think of the statement that "the battle was in the wood of Ephraim?"³ Has the historian forgotten his geography? and is this one of those slips in details, which indicate either the fabulousness of the narrative, or the untrustworthiness of the narrator? How else are we to account for this striking inconsistency which first places both armies east of the Jordan, and then makes the battle take place in the territory of a tribe to the west of it?

Not quite so fast. "The wood of Ephraim" does not mean one of the many woods situate within the borders of the tribe of Ephraim. Had that been the historian's meaning he would have said not "the wood" but "*a* wood." It is not in Manchester that we look for "Manchester Buildings;" and it is no thought of Leicester that is suggested by "Leicester Square." Thus the very form of expression is an indication that we are to look for "the wood of Ephraim" elsewhere than in the tribe of Ephraim. Turn now to the history of the anarchy under the Judges, and you find it at once in the memorial of one of those fatal downfalls which befel Ephraim's pride. For who—in Ephraim's own estimation—might be compared with Ephraim? Had he not, by their great ancestor himself, been "set before Manasseh?" Had not "the lot" (the disposing of which was of the Lord) of Ephraim fallen on a fair ground—the centre of the tribes? Was not Shiloh there, the religious capital, from Joshua to Saul, more than three hundred years? Could it not boast Shechem too, the political capital and the common gathering point of the Tribes? Was there any other tribe that could boast the possession of Jacob's well, and the

³ 2 Sa. xviii. 6.

fulfilment—both literal and figurative—of the long cherished prediction “Joseph is a fruitful bough ; even a fruitful bough by a well ?” Whither did the Judges repair as to the proper seat of government, but to Ephraim ?⁴ What then so proper as that the ten tribes should be denoted under the comprehensive name of Ephraim ;⁵ or that the gate of Jerusalem looking towards Israel should be called “the gate of Ephraim ;”⁶ or that Ephraim and Judah together should represent the whole people from Dan to Beersheba ; or—in one word—that David reviewing the resources of his consolidated empire should exclaim “Ephraim is the strength of my head !”⁷

How natural then was the tone of authority, and even menace, which this tribe habitually assumed ! Yet the history of “the wood of Ephraim” shows that it was assumed once too often. They had tried it with Gideon when they chid him “sharply ;” and it succeeded. For “he said unto them ‘What have I now done in comparison of you ? Is not the gleaning of the grapes of Ephraim better than the vintage of Abi-ezer ?’ . . . Then their anger was abated toward him when he had said that.”⁸ But when, a century later, they tried it with Jephthah, they mistook their man. Gideon was a man of peace, not more reluctant to be dragged into public life than anxious to make an early escape from it again. The glitter of monarchy, pressed upon him as it was, had no attractions to be compared with those of his fields and vineyards, his wine-press and threshing-floor. But Jephthah the Gileadite was a man of another mould. Instead of the peaceful answer which turneth away wrath, his was the appeal to arms that defied it. “We will burn thine house upon thee with fire,” said the haughty Ephraimites. He retorts their burning words with burning

⁴ E. g. Deborah “dwelt under the palm-tree of Deborah . . . in Mount Ephraim.”

Gideon, though of Ophrah in Manasseh, had a family at Shechem.

Abimelech made Shechem his head quarters.

“And after Abimelech” Tola,

though “a man of Issachar,” “dwelt in Shamir in Mount Ephraim,”—Shechem having been recently laid waste,—“and judged Israel twenty-three years.

⁵ 2 Ch xxv. 6; 7.

⁶ 2 Ki. xiv. 13.

⁷ Ps. lx. 7.

⁸ Ju. viii. 1, 3.

deeds. He summons his clansmen, proud of their chief; puts himself at their head, and in one decisive battle avenges the insult he had received. But this is not enough. His foe shall not escape him. They have gone unchastised too long. Flight shall not avail them. He possesses himself of the fords of the Jordan, and by means of that dialectic Shibboleth which has been a by-word ever since, the fugitives of Ephraim are massacred to a man. "And there fell at that time of the Ephraimites forty and two thousand."⁹

Now what memorial so likely for the grave of a tribe as its own name assigned to the spot where it fell? the Aceldama of their race? Thus the history under the Judges gives us in the land of Gilead not merely a wood of Ephraim, but that particularly memorable and fatal wood which is referred to in the history under the Kings. The solution is complete; and it is furnished by the sacred narrative itself.¹⁰

The conflicting predictions concerning Zedekiah present a difficulty of another sort; in as much as, although no difficulty to us who see the obscurity and contrariety of the prophetic utterances dissipated by the event, yet to the Jews living at the time and on the spot, the difficulty must have appeared of the gravest kind. Six years before the event Ezekiel had declared that Zedekiah should not see Babylon, and yet he should die there.¹¹ Four years later Jeremiah said¹² "Thine eyes shall behold the eyes of the King of Babylon, and he shall speak with thee mouth to mouth, and thou shalt go to Babylon." Zedekiah, (so Josephus informs us) thinking these prophecies contradictory, believed neither. But both were exactly fulfilled. Zedekiah did see the King of Babylon, not at Babylon, but at Riblah, whence, his eyes being put out, he was carried to Babylon and died there.

In 2 Ki. xvi. 9, the king of Assyria is said to have "hearkened unto Ahaz;" but in 2 Ch. xxviii. 20, we read that he "distressed him, but strengthened him not." Both statements,

⁹ Ju. xii. 6.

¹⁰ Compare also the account given in Jo. xvii. (vv. 8—18); especially v. 10, "Southward it was Ephraim's," with Ju. xii. 1, "The

men of Ephraim gathered themselves together, and went northward."

¹¹ Eze. xii. 13.

¹² Je. xxxiv. 3.

as Horne remarks, are true. He did help him against the king of Syria, took Damascus, and delivered Ahaz from the power of the Syrians. But the service was of little value, for he did not assist him against the Edomites or Philistines, and he distressed him by taking the royal treasures and the treasures of the temple, and rendered him but little service for so great a sacrifice. Very much like the way in which Tiglath-pileser “hearkened unto Ahaz” was the way in which Hengist and Horsa hearkened to the ancient Britons. They repelled the incursions of the Picts and Scots, but they made themselves masters of the country.

In the account of St. Paul’s miraculous conversion (Ac. ix. 7) St. Luke tells us that St. Paul’s fellow travellers (not unlike Daniel’s companions on a similar occasion) heard a voice, but saw no man. St. Paul himself says (Ac. xxii. 9) that they saw the light, but “heard not the voice.” Dazzled, blinded, as they were by having seen “the light,” we cannot wonder that they saw “no man.” But how about the hearing? Could they both hear, and not hear, at the same time? Yes, if the word “to hear” is not used both times in the same sense. And it is not. It very frequently means understood; ¹³ and is sometimes, of necessity, so translated. See 1 Co. xiv. 2, as an example; also Ge. xi. 7, and xlvi. 23, where the LXX use it for *γνῶσθε*. Thus then, they heard a voice, but not the words spoken; they heard a sound, but did not understand the meaning of it.¹⁴ Just as we are told (Ge. xlvi. 8, 10) that Israel beheld Joseph’s sons; while a few verses afterwards, it is said that his eyes were dim, so that he could not see; “i.e. he could see, but not distinctly—could not distinguish the features unless they came near.”

And to take but one instance more. In one place it is said

¹³ E. g. Mar. iv. 33. Jno. vi. 60.

¹⁴ A distinction plainly conveyed in the original, which has the genitive (*τῆς φωνῆς*) in ch. ix. 7, but the accusative (*τὴν δὲ φωνὴν*) in xxii. 9. And it is this use of *ἀκοίνευ* with the acc. (to denote understanding as well as learning)

that is found in the LXX of Ge. xi. 7. The English reader will find this distinction confirmed by Jno. xii. 29, where the “voice from heaven” was mistaken for thunder, even by those who are said to have “heard it.” They heard the sound, but not the words.

that Jesus "baptized." But in another we read that "Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples." When we note that the second statement is explanatory of the first, and is expressly so given by the author of both, we not only perceive their agreement but are possessed of an important principle. The "disciples" whom Jesus "made," were baptized by His authority, though not with His own hands. Applying this principle (*qui facit per alterum facit per se*) we reconcile St. Luke's statement (Ac. i. 18) that "this man (i.e. Judas) purchased a field," with St. Matthew's (xxvii. 7.) who tells us that the chief priests bought the field with the money which Judas threw down in their midst.

Of this class are Bishop Colenso's difficulties. They are not new. They are not formidable. Yet they have made some noise in the world.¹⁵ They have produced a sensation precisely similar to that which would have been witnessed if the gravest of our bishops had appeared in a penny theatre to sing a comic song, or a judge of the Court of Queen's Bench had announced a performance on the tight rope in Westminster Hall. If the attraction lay in the subject, or in the superior scholarship which marks its treatment, men would read the neglected pages of Davidson; it is the singularity of the spectacle presented by the writer, that attracts them to Colenso. To see a man who has repeatedly declared, and that with the utmost solemnity, that he does "unfeignedly" believe and receive all the canonical Scriptures,—to see this man spare no pains in his endeavours to deride and degrade them, this is the intellectual paradox. To see one who stigmatizes the Church as a gigantic corporation sworn to sustain and propagate a stupendous lie, and then, when you expect to see him indignantly disavow, for his own part, all further connection with it, to see this very man complacently continuing his membership in this corrupt corporation, eagerly clutching at every quibble which may help him to retain the emoluments he

¹⁵ The reader will remember the boast of Goldsmith's hero—" My parents made some noise in the world: for my mother cried oys-

ters, and my father beat a drum." Bp. Colenso's celebrity is as much more ignoble as its cause has been less useful.

enjoys as the compensation of his co-partnership in its crimes, and while he acts the part of informer by denouncing the fraud, acting also the part of receiver by sharing the profits,—This is the moral paradox. Yet this is a trifle to what follows. For the subject of this moral insensibility is keenly alive to the practical advantages of his inconsistency. He knows full well how to trade on the simplicity of those who mistake profession for practice. Are they shocked at the spectacle of a dignitary so exalted retaining the emoluments of an office whose functions he is no longer qualified to discharge? Let them look into his “Preface,” and see his wordy admiration of Truth. To repudiate the most solemn obligations merely because they cannot be enforced by legal penalties, is certainly not the course of procedure we should have expected from a bishop; but how can you condemn a man who writes about self-sacrifice for the sake of truth as this same bishop has done in his Preface to “The Pentateuch Examined”? But even this perplexity is not the greatest. It is surpassed by the contrast between the fairness of his professions and the unfairness of his practice in the principal matter at issue. He tells us how long and earnestly he has wished and striven to believe in the truth of the Pentateuch. And straightway he proceeds to strain every nerve and practice every artifice in order to make it appear that the Pentateuch is false. His pleadings against the historic verity are everywhere characterized by the same determined “malice prepense.” His *animus* is irrepressible. He has a grudge against Moses. And in his eagerness to gratify that grudge, it is hard to say whether the grossest ignorance or the most determined captiousness, the distortion or omission of facts, the *suppressio veri* or the *suggestio falsi*, be most conspicuous.

To the proof. Take his very first difficulty; a difficulty “not discovered by modern criticism, but observed and explained centuries ago by Christian fathers and Jewish Rabbis.” It relates to Judah’s age and the birth-place of his grandchildren Hezron and Hamul; and it rests on two *suppositions*:—first that the historian meant to convey the idea that Hezron and Hamul were born in Canaan; secondly, that at the descent into Egypt, Judah’s age was forty-two. As to the

first, the bishop quotes Gen. xlvi. 12,¹⁶ and then says "It appears to me to be certain that the writer means to say that Hezron and Hamul were *born in the land of Canaan*, and were among the seventy persons (including Jacob himself, and Joseph, and his two sons), who *came into Egypt* with Jacob." But the text does not say so. Even in that solitary text¹⁷ which seems (at first sight) favorable to this supposition, the stress of the argument lies on a single word, and that word is not in the Hebrew. The word "with" seems to imply that the sixty-six were then all living, and accompanied Jacob. But this very word (the foundation of the argument) is a mistranslation. The Hebrew has neither **בְּ** (eth) nor **בַּ** (im), but **בָּ** (l), which signifies "To, Of, Belonging to," as is explained in the following verse, "All the souls of the house of Jacob."¹⁸ The accurate translation therefore is, "All the souls of, or belonging to, Jacob, who came down into Egypt—were sixty-six." The text says nothing at all of their accompanying him, nor of the time at which they went down, but simply that they who went down were sixty-six. When the word "with" is used,¹⁹ the names of those who had households are given, (which Hezron and Hamul had not) and they are those of the eleven sons of Jacob. There is therefore no passage whatever which asserts that the sixty-six, including Hezron and Hamul, were alive, and went into Egypt at the time of Jacob's going down.

But further. Not only is this argument unwarranted by the text; it is unsupported by the *usus loquendi*, which speaks of parents and children as one person:²⁰ a mode of speech not merely admitted, but strongly affirmed by Colenso

¹⁶ "And the sons of Judah, Er, and Onan, and Shelah, and Pharez, and Zarah; but Er and Onan died in the land of Canaan; and the sons of Pharez, Hezron and Hamul." Thus the bishop *mis-quotes* the passage. (See below.)

¹⁷ Gen. lxvi. 26. "All the souls that came with Jacob into Egypt."

¹⁸ Ge. xlvi. 26. **לִבְנֵת יִעָקֹב**: Of (or be-

longing to) Jacob.

Ge. xlvi. 27. **לִבְנֵת יִעָקֹב**: Of the house of Jacob.

¹⁹ Ex. i. 1.

²⁰ Thus, *e. g.* (in v. 4) "I will go down with thee into Egypt, and I will surely bring thee up again;" a promise fulfilled in the bringing up of Jacob's children at the Exodus

himself in other instances,²¹ and not now invented for the solution of difficulties, but recognised (as the bishop himself shows) both by the Samaritans and the LXX., i.e. more than two thousand years ago. So that there is no real difficulty even if Judah were only forty-two years old at the time of the descent. But instead of this, he was at any rate forty-eight or forty-nine;²² and at that age—with the early marriages common in the East—grandchildren would be a natural result. Among the Polish Jews, until lately, boys were commonly married in their fifteenth year. And even in England, “Edwy, Edgar, Edward I., Edward III., Prince Arthur, son of Henry VII., all married about fifteen or sixteen. And a friend reminds me that Edward the Black Prince was born three months before his father had completed his seventeenth year.”

And yet, in spite of all this—the wording of the text, the usage of the writer, and the other undeniable facts of the history—our critic assumes that his view of the question is absolutely “certain.” Will it be believed that, in order to recommend his view to the adoption of the reader, he actually misquotes the passage he adduces as the warrant for that view? It is incredible: but not the less true. As the words stand in the Bible they have all the appearance of being a parenthetical clause, intended to supplement the information respecting the family of Judah. The expression “The sons of Pharez *WERE*,” is a different formula from that employed in all the other enumerations. Our critic, however, for reasons best known to himself, omits all that could make it appear a *parenthetical* clause, leaves out the verb, and thus assimilates the expression to that *one* formula which is applied throughout the chapter to the sons of Jacob and their descendants, who are *expressly said* to have gone with him into Egypt. And then he says, “It appears to me to be certain that the writer here means to say, that Hezron and Hamul were *born in the land of Canaan* ;” that is, after having himself destroyed *all appearance* of its being possible to mean something different!

²¹ Especially in his interpretation of Ex. xii. 40.

²² Many writers have shewn this:

see *e. g.* Dr. Mc. Caul's “Examination of Bishop Colenso's Difficulties.”

"I hesitate to call this a deliberate falsification of the document, but I know not how otherwise to account for it. The writer could not have taken it from the Hebrew, for the verb he has omitted stares him in the face: he could not have copied it from the authorized version; for not only must there have been the change of the construction and omission of the verb, but a total change of punctuation."²³ But to regard it as a piece of mere blundering,—and this is the aspect at once most charitable and most welcome,—is it not remarkable that a man of Dr. Colenso's known accuracy in his own province—that of the mathematics—should thus blunder in his very *first* quotation from a book, the monstrous blunders of which he is about to prove? Certainly, any man may prove them—if he first makes them!

A similar instance of this obliquity of vision is furnished by the alleged difficulty as to the "shekel of the sanctuary."²⁴ For the difficulty alleged is this:—that the shekel of the sanctuary, or "sacred shekel," (mentioned here for the first time) is mentioned six or seven months *at least*, before the people could have known what it was or what was its value. But here again, the difficulty is not in the Bible. It has first to be made; and then interpolated. It is made by the omission (not this time of a word merely, but) of an entire clause. And the moment this omission is rectified the whole difficulty disappears. The objector actually quotes the verse which supplies the explanation; but he so quotes it as to omit the explanation. There it stands, however; and he who runs may

²³ Roger's "Vindication :" p. 43. "The hypercriticism of the writer is still further shewn by his adding, that Hezron and Hamul were clearly designed to be reckoned 'among the seventy persons (including Jacob himself and Joseph and his two sons) who came into Egypt with Jacob.' Yet he knows perfectly well that the historian never disguises the fact, that he did not mean to say that Joseph

and his two sons came down with Jacob, or that the two last were born in Canaan at all! Why, with this open declaration on the historian's part that he is not to be interpreted with this absurd literality, does our critic pretend that it is certain that Hezron and Hamul are designed to be represented as born in Canaan?" *Ibid.*

²⁴ Bp. Colenso's "Pentateuch Examined"; ch. vii. p. 41.

read :—“a shekel is twenty gerahs.”²⁵ “It would perhaps be unjust to accuse Dr. Colenso of wilfully suppressing what takes away the force of his objection. The omission may be ascribed to the precipitancy with which his criticism has proceeded, and that strong bias of the mind to mark difficulties without perceiving that the means of removing them is found in the context.”²⁶

Remarkable however, as are his omissions, his additions are still more so. In his seventh chapter he makes merry with a direction of the Levitical law, which he first of all misquotes. Lev. iv. 11, 12, according to him reads thus :—“And the skin of the bullock, and all his flesh, with his head and with his legs, and with his inwards, and his dung, even the whole bullock, shall he [the priest]²⁷ carry forth without the camp to a clean place.” Having thus first made an addition of his own invention, and inserted it in the text, he proceeds to caricature it, by telling us that “in fact, we have to imagine the Priest having himself to carry *on his back on foot*, from St. Paul’s to the outskirts of the Metropolis, ‘the skin, and flesh, and head, and legs, and inwards, and dung,’ even the whole bullock.”

“Here we have to charge Bishop Colenso with something worse than want of common sense, with unauthorized addition to the words of Scripture, in order to excite the profane mirth of his readers, by exhibiting a ridiculous picture of the Priest ‘on foot,’ carrying the whole bullock ‘ON HIS BACK.’ Bishop Colenso well knows that the words ‘on foot,’ and ‘on his back,’ are not in the text. He has added them gratuitously to exaggerate the difficulty. Wilful addition to the words of the author is as inconsistent with that love of truth which the

²⁵ Ex. xxx. 13 As quoted by Bp Colenso :—

“This they shall give, everyone that passeth among them that are numbered, half a shekel after the shekel of the sanctuary; an half shekel shall be the offering of Jehovah.”

But in the English Bible the verse stands thus :—

“This they shall give, everyone that passeth among them that are numbered, half a shekel after the shekel of the sanctuary: (a shekel is twenty gerahs:) an half shekel shall be the offering to the Lord.”

²⁶ Dr. Mc. Caul.

²⁷ Bp. Colenso’s insertion: the words are not in the English Version, nor in the Hebrew Text.”

Bishop so often professes, as ridicule is with respect for the opinions of others, and unwillingness to give unnecessary pain. Indeed, profane humour is incompatible with that seriousness of mind which is indispensable in the investigation of truth. It is bad enough in Voltaire, but quite unworthy of the sacred office of a bishop. The objection itself is as absurd, as the mode of stating it is offensive to good taste. Even as the English version stands, a reasonable man would infer that the Priest, one of the highest dignitaries in the congregation of Israel, might have this work performed by some one else, without personal service. But by insisting that the word 'carry,' means transportation *on his back, and on foot*, Dr. Colenso betrays his ignorance both of the English language and the Hebrew text.²⁸ In the Bible itself, our translators have often used the word "carry," where it is impossible to suppose that it means bearing on the back.²⁹ Nor is this use of the word peculiar to the Bible. It is the language of poets and historians and the language of common life. Queen Margaret says of her husband

"I would the college of the cardinals
Would choose him pope, and carry him to Rome."³⁰

And Robertson relates how, after the battle of Mohacz, "Solyman, after his victory, seized and kept possession of several towns of the greatest strength in the southern provinces of Hungary, and overrunning the rest of the country, carried near two hundred thousand persons into captivity." Now suppose (says Dr. Mc. Caul) that some arithmetical critic were

²⁸ Dr. Mc. Caul's "Examination."

²⁹ We know that David was not permitted to lay a finger on the ark, and yet (by the ministry of the Levites appointed for that purpose) he "carried it aside into the house of Obed-Edom" (2 Sa. vi. 10) So, it is said of Tilgath-pilneser (1 Ch. v. 26) "he carried them away, even the Reubenites, and the Gadites, and the half tribe of Manasseh, and brought them to Halah, and Habor, and Hara," &c. : and of Nebuchadnezzar (2 Ki.

xxiv. 14,) that he "carried away all Jerusalem, and all the princes, and all the mighty men of valour, ten thousand captives, and all the craftsmen and smiths." To be consistent with himself Dr. Colenso is bound to contend that these transports were effected *on foot, on the backs* of the Kings of Assyria and Babylon, and that therefore, these narratives are unhistoric.

³⁰ Shakspeare: King Henry VI., Part II., Act I., Sc. 3.

to object to this account, that the circumstance here related is impossible, that it would take so many, say ten days for Solyman to carry one person on his back, on foot to the nearest Turkish province, and five days to return ; that it would therefore take him three million days, or more than eight thousand two hundred and nineteen years, to carry the two hundred thousand persons into captivity ; and hence conclude that the narrative is unhistoric and unworthy of credit. What would Dr. Colenso himself reply to such a critic ? He might at first, perhaps, be tempted to laugh, but would ultimately mourn over the unhappy wreck of intellect betrayed in such misunderstanding of plain English, and such an ill-timed and preposterous display of arithmetical power.

But besides this perversion of plain English there is the still more extraordinary perversion (if it be not ignorance) of the Hebrew. Just as in English, we modify the meaning of a verb by the alteration of a single letter, and from "to fall" derive "to fell," (i.e. to cause to fall,) just so in Hebrew a similar modification gives a similar causative sense. So that in this instance the literal translation is not "he shall carry forth," but "he shall cause to go forth." The *how* is left to the Priest's own discretion : and the agency employed for this purpose was probably that of wagons (which we know were in use for other purposes) or beasts of burden. A similar instance in Le. xiv. 44, 45, is conclusive on this point. We there read "Then the priest shall come and look, and behold if the plague be spread in the house, it is a fretting leprosy in the house : it is unclean. And he shall break down the house, the stones of it and the timber thereof, and all the mortar of the house ; and he shall carry them forth [*v'hotsi*, the same word as above, i.e. he shall cause to go forth] out of the city into an unclean place." Can Dr. Colenso imagine that the Priest was to do all this personally, and thus act, not only as conductor of public worship, but at the same time as bricklayer and scavenger, and not be allowed even the convenience of a cart, but carry all the stones and timber, &c., on his back on foot ? With just as much reason he might believe that God commanded Moses to carry all the children of Israel on his back out of Egypt, because it is said (Ex. iii. 10), "Come now therefore and I will

send thee unto Pharaoh, and cause them to go forth [the same word *v'hotse*] my people out of Egypt."

Hitherto we have argued as if the words "he shall carry forth" were spoken of the Priest. But if Dr. Colenso be a Hebrew scholar he must know on mere grammatical grounds, that this is by no means certain; that the third person preterite of the verb is often used impersonally; and that it is so rendered by modern versions as well as by the LXX. Thus the French version has "*On démolira donc la maison, ses pierres, son bois, avec tout son mortier, et on les transportera hors de la ville.*" According to this translation, fully justified by Hebrew usage, the Priest is to come and look, others are to break down the house, and carry away the materials. And this is the sense given by Luther, Zunz, Fürst, &c. It is also the sense known to the LXX., two thousand years ago, as according to the best reading, they have in Le. iv. 12, *ἐξοίσουσιν*, "they shall carry out;"³¹ and in Le. xiv. 45, (*καὶ καθελοῦσι τὴν οἰκίαν . . . καὶ πάντα τὸν χοῦν ἐξοίσουσιν*,) both verbs are again in the third person plural. "Thus whether we look to the meaning of the word 'carry,' as used by our English translators, or to its common use in English poets and historians, or to the meaning of the Hebrew word *hotsi*, or to interpretations ancient and modern, we find abundant reason for rejecting Dr. Colenso's interpretation and his objection founded on it, as equally opposed to common sense, to Hebrew usage and grammar, and, we may add, to authority; for amidst all the translators, critics, scoffers and objectors to the Pentateuch, so far as I know, not one has ever before put forth this absurdity:" an absurdity of which Mr. BIRKS justly says, that "it seems to bear away the palm from all the rest."³²

Yet even this grotesque parody does not stand alone. If

³¹ What is particularly noticeable here is the sudden change of the LXX. from the singular to the plural (or impersonal form) *ἐξοίσουσιν ὄλον τὸν μόσχον*, "they shall carry out the bullock", or, impersonally, it shall be carried out; by whom is not specified.

On this point, as on each of the others, there are some excellent remarks in "Bishop Colenso's Criticism Criticised," by the Rev. J. B. Mc. Caul, p. 11. (Wertheim and Co.)

³² The Exodus of Israel: page 248.

unsurpassed, it is fairly rivalled by many others. Take, for instance, the caricature of the priest's duties and their "perquisites," the "enormous provision for Aaron and his two sons and their families. The whole of the sin offerings, trespass offerings, and meat offerings, except a handful, to be eaten only by the three males in the most holy place ! The very pigeons, to be brought as sin offerings after the birth of children, would have been according to the story, 264 a-day, and each priest would have had to eat more than eighty-eight for his own portion daily, 'in the most holy place !'"

So says our critic. The births, "according to" his parody of "the story," were just 264 a-day in the wilderness, because that is the average of London³³ "for a week taken at random, Sept. 3, 1862."³⁴ But according to the data of the Pentateuch itself, they would be about 120 daily, or less than half the "random" number.

As to the "enormous provision," it consisted of three things. "First, of the sin offerings and trespass offerings of the common people, at the time when God assures us by the prophet Amos, that 'slain beasts and sacrifices' were *not* offered.³⁵ (Amos v. 25.) Secondly, of all the meat offerings of *flour* 'except a handful,' at a time when they lived on *manna*, because there were no supplies of corn. Thirdly, of the turtle doves or pigeons³⁶ brought as sin offerings by Jewish mothers, thirty-three days after the circumcision of their infant

³³ But the average of London has nothing to do with the matter. For its population is greater by a million than that of Israel at that time. The latter number, according to the most probable estimates was between 1,700,000 and 1,800,000, whereas the former, by the last census was 2,803,000.

³⁴ The "Pentateuch Examined," p. 62.

³⁵ Besides they were not all of an obligatory character. Many were purely voluntary. And on this the Rabbincical commentators

lay great stress in explaining Je. vii. 22, referring to Le. i. 2 which shows that the sacrifice was not required to be brought, but only prescribes what was to be done if it were brought.

³⁶ As an illustration of the way in which critics hostile to the Bible are agreed among themselves, it is noteworthy that the command here referred to (Le. xii. 2), is just one of those which Dr. S. Davison pronounces to be genuine and Mosaic. See "Introduction," vol. i. p. iii.

children, at a time when none of those children were circumcised! (Josh. v. 5, 7.)" "The suggestion that Aaron and his sons were obliged by the law of God, to eat eighty-eight pigeons apiece daily in the Holy of holies, is a strange compound of bad arithmetic, falsified history, and mournful irreverence."³⁷

Our critic indeed assures us that "it cannot be said that the laws" here caricatured "were intended only for a later time, when the people were settled in the land of Canaan." But why can it not? The attempt to bolster up the assertion by a reference to the "tent" of the leper is as inconclusive as it is irrelevant. The case of the leper was a special case, provided for by special enactment. It is strange, indeed, if that "cannot be said" which the text itself says five times over in explicit terms.³⁸

But even this does not suffice. In the same chapter he tells us that "in the seventh month, for several days together, besides the daily sacrifice, there were to be extraordinary additional sacrifices;" and then enumerating these, he adds, "Lastly, if it should be thought that the above sacrificial system was not meant to be in full operation in the wilderness, we may call attention to the frequent references made, in the enunciation of these laws, to the camp, Lev. iv. 12, 21; vi. 11; xiii. 4, 6; xiv. 3, 8, &c." So that here we have a Christian Bishop who "would persuade his reader, as he believes himself, that all this work of the seventh month was in full operation in the camp, and there may be people so ignorant of the Bible as to receive this statement without hesitation. But any one tolerably acquainted with the Scriptures knows that the feast of the seventh month is the feast of tabernacles, to be celebrated in the Holy Land, as a reminiscence of their fathers having dwelt in tabernacles in the wilderness, and not in the desert. Whilst they were actually living in tabernacles, they did not want any memento of the kind. But Dr. Colenso, in searching for pabulum for his difficulties, saw only the amount of work, and forgot or was ignorant of the time and place

³⁷ The Exodus of Israel, page 256. | ³⁸ Nu. xv. 2; De. iv. 5; iv. 14; v. 31; xii. 8, 9.

where it was to be accomplished. If he had remembered the parallel passage in Lev. xxiii. 39, 'Also in the fifteenth day of the seventh month, when ye have gathered in *the fruit of the land*, ye shall keep a feast unto the Lord seven days,' he could not have committed this blunder."³⁹

With one other instance of this forgetfulness, or ignorance, or worse, we must quit this part of the subject. And as the bishop thinks any errors of his First Part are amply compensated by the validity of Part Third,⁴⁰ this specimen shall be taken from that part. He is attempting to prove the Book of Deuteronomy to be a forgery of Jeremiah; and so he picks out a number of passages which he tells us "Moses never could have written." One very trivial fact on which he lays so much stress, is thus stated:—"Whereas in the other books the priests are always styled the 'sons of Aaron,' in Deuteronomy they are always called the 'sons of Levi.' It is *impossible to believe* that any writer, whether Moses or any other, should have so suddenly changed his form of expression in such a case as this, in the very short interval of a few days or weeks at most."

But what will the reader think of Bishop Colenso when he finds that instead of "the very short interval of a few days or weeks at most," the Mosaic Record, thus misrepresented, actually tells us that the interval which really separated these two styles was one of nearly thirty-nine years in duration! and further, that the events which transpired in that interval were such as not only to account for the change, but such as to require it!

The latest instance in which the phrase "the sons of Aaron, the priests," occurs, is in Numbers x. 8; and the date immediately follows, (v. 11)—"the twentieth of the second month, in the second year." But Deuteronomy begins "in the fortieth year, in the eleventh month" (ch. i. v. 3). In the intervening period (thirty-eight years and nine months nearly) Aaron, Nadab, Abihu and all that generation, (Moses, Joshua, and Caleb excepted) had passed away. Could anything be more natural than that in the beginning of the march the phrase

³⁹ Dr. Mc. Caul: "Examination of Bp. Colenso's Difficulties," pp. 127, 128.

⁴⁰ See his "Pentateuch Examined," vol. iii., Pref. p. viii.

⁴¹ Ibid. p. 395.

denoting the officiating priesthood should denote the persons first inducted into the priestly office, and at that time actually employed in it; or that when these were no more—"Aaron and his (own) sons" being constantly "out of sight" and becoming gradually "out of mind,"—their less distinguished successors should receive the more comprehensive and equally correct designation, "the priests, the sons of Levi"?

But even if it were possible—in spite of such instances as these—to acquit our critic of dishonesty, it would still be impossible to acquit him of incompetence. Not to speak of other deficiencies, his ignorance of Hebrew, and of Rabbinical literature is such as to have provoked the derision of learned Jews themselves. Thus his criticism about the "booths" (Le. xxiii. 40—43,)⁴² is scouted as "a mistake which may be overlooked if made by the brilliant author of 'Coningsby,' but which is unpardonable in one who is an eminent divine, and is anxious to be considered a learned critic. A Jewish child would set the Bishop right on this point . . ."⁴³

But he has another point. He says the history gives the people "booths." But "it cannot be supposed" that they really did "cut down boughs and bushes to make booths of." And further, "there is not the slightest indication in the story that they ever dwelt in booths, nor is it conceivable when they could have done so." Well, one would imagine that if the booths are so utterly inconceivable, the mention of tents would be welcome. Not a bit of it: the tents are as impossible as the booths. How could they acquire them? how could they carry them? "what a prodigious number of trained oxen would have been needed!" What avails it to point out that these "prodigious" difficulties are the critic's own creation! that the very mention of both booths and tents obviates any difficulties that might have been started on the supposition of the exclusive use of either; that there certainly were wagons as well as oxen in the camp of Israel;⁴⁴ and that in the name of the station

⁴² "The Pentateuch Examined." | chief Rabbi in London); Letter Part i. ch. 8. | to the "Athenæum," Dec. 6, 1862.

⁴³ Dr. Hermann Adler (son of the | "Nu. vii. 3, et seq.

between Rameses and Etham, Succoth (i.e. booths),⁴⁵ we have not indeed “the slightest” but the very strongest indication that the dwelling in booths was an undeniable fact. No matter: if the Alps stood in the way of Bishop Colenso’s criticism, “so much the worse for them;” “there shall be no Alps!” And therefore he will have it that this mention of *booths* “conflicts strangely with the mention of *tents*, Ex. xvi. 16.” This assertion is supported by another of those ineffable utterances so common with this writer. “It cannot be said that the word *booths* means tents, for the Hebrew word for a booth is quite different from that for a *tent* used in Ex. xvi. 16.” Alas, for the bishop’s opinion as to what “cannot be said!” “A horse and a quadruped,” says Mr. Birks, “are not the same word: they are quite different words, and still a horse is a quadruped. *Booth* is not the same word with *tents*, and still booths may be tents of a particular kind: for even the houses in Palestine are called *tents* very many times.”⁴⁶ Dr. McCaul elaborates this argument, and by a large range of quotations utterly refutes this ignorant opinion both “by the etymology and the usage of the word.” He then asks, “Does Dr. Colenso mean that the lair of the lion, or the pavilion of Benhadad, or the tabernacle of David, or the Tabernacle of God, was made ‘of boughs and bushes,’ or does he presume to call the author of the Book of Kings, or David, or Amos to task, and say they use the word *Succah* ‘improperly?’”⁴⁷ It is to be presumed that Dr. Colenso overlooked, and did not suppress, this meaning of *Succah*. . . . The etymology and the usage show that *Succah* expresses the *genus*, of which *booth* and *tent* are only *species*; and the great festival is called “the feast of *Succoth*,” tabernacles, and could not be called the feast of *Ohelim*, *tents*, for then the booths of the poor would be excluded, and it would seem as if Israel in the wilderness had dwelt in tents, and tents only; and Dr. Colenso might with some plausibility have asked whence they got them all. The feast of *Succoth*, taber-

⁴⁵ Ex. xii. 37. For the reason of the name cf. Ge. xxxiii. 17 as to Succoth in Gilead.

⁴⁶ De. xvi. 7; Jo. xxii. 4, 6, 8;

Ju. vii. 8; xix. 9; 1 Sa. iv. 10; &c.

⁴⁷ It seems like it: for contrasting סְכָךְ *Succah* (booth) with אֹהֶל *Ohel* (tent) he says that when as in

nacles, embraces both the *tents* of the rich and the *booths* of the poor. Some dwelt in one, some in the other, all doubtless in whatever they could procure; and thus Dr. Colenso has thrown away much arithmetic, which might have been prevented if he had enquired into the meaning of words before he invoked the aid of figures.”⁴⁸

An example of similar ignorance is found in the sense which he attaches to הַזֶּה *Hazzeh*, “this,” in Ex. xii. 12. On which Dr. McCaul—himself one of the very first Hebrew scholars in Europe—justly observes, “Now, as a general rule, this is all very well, and necessary to be observed by beginners in Hebrew;” and then, after shewing its utter inapplicability to the matter in hand, he demonstrates the bishop’s Hebrew criticism to be absolutely “of no value, as it proceeds simply from inadequate acquaintance with Hebrew idiom.”

More glaring still, though of less importance, is his imaginary distinction between “*the door*” of the Tabernacle, and “*the whole end* of the Tabernacle in which the door was.”⁴⁹ He thinks that the end was of the nature of a wall or partition, in which the door was hung. But had he carefully read the account of the construction of the Tabernacle, or understood the meaning of the word “*Pethach*,” here translated *door*, he would have known that no distinction of the kind can be made, but that the *end* of the Tabernacle is itself what our translators have called the *door*. The word *Pethach* signifies *opening*, and is therefore used of the opening of a tent, or entrance, as well as of a *doorway*. So with regard to the tent or Tabernacle of the congregation, the end through which the priests went into the Holy Place was entirely open, and the opening is called *Pethach*. When it was to be closed, it was not by means of a door hung in the end, but by a hanging drawn across, (Ex. xxxvi. 37,) and called *Masakh*. For *door* in our signification, the Hebrew has another word, *Deleth*, from *Dalah*, to hang.⁵⁰ Our translators were not ignorant of the difference,

“2 Sa. xi. 11, and one or two other places,” it is used of tents, “it is used improperly.”

⁴⁸ *Examination*, p. 49.

⁴⁹ *The Pentateuch Examined*:

Part I. ch. iv.

⁵⁰ In the Holy Land, the Tabernacle had *doors* (*Daloth*) added to it. See 1 Sa. i. 9; and iii. 15.

as appears from their translation of Ge. xviii. 1, where they say of Abraham, "He sat *in* the tent door;" not "at the door." "In the tent door" can only mean in the opening. But the English translators thought that on the whole the word *door* was the most intelligible for the general reader. The error of Dr. Colenso, both with regard to the structure of the Tabernacle, and the meaning of the Hebrew words, indicates a want of accuracy fatal to his pretensions as a critic.⁵¹

And is it to the demands of a "trashy sciolism" such as this—disingenuous, dishonest, superficial,⁵² and partial—that we are expected to surrender the truth of the Bible?

"How big ought a volume to be," asks an able writer on this subject, "in order to be rated as a satisfactory answer, say to an octavo volume full of absurdities, quibbles, and all sorts of impertinences, historical, critical, geographical, theological, arithmetical, and what not? Must an octavo be allowed to stand upon its dignity and never surrender except to a quarto volume? Or may it engage, on equal terms, with another octavo, provided always that the enemy is of equal tonnage, and carries the same number of guns, i.e. page for page, and chapter for chapter? In this warfare, is it allowed to the blockading vessel to refuse to go down, however rifled and battered, if the shot and shell are not of a given weight and size? We have asked ourselves these questions, because we constantly hear a demand for a full answer to the Bishop of Natal, before any further proceedings are taken against him... Now, it strikes us, that except on the principle that only an octavo can give battle to an octavo, the infidel bishop is rather over answered than otherwise. We noticed several replies in

⁵¹ An Examination of Bp. Colenso's Difficulties, p. 24.

⁵² See some striking examples of this superficiality in the Second Part of Dr. Mc. Caul's "Examination." *Eg.*, The Bishop tells us in paragraph 210 of his second part that "only Jehovah" is used in Ge. xxiv, and that nineteen times; and infers that this chapter cannot have come from the same

hand with other chapters in which "only Elohim" is used many times over. And yet it is a fact as Dr. Mc. Caul points out, and as any one may satisfy himself by taking down a Hebrew Bible, that in this very chapter the name Elohim occurs again and again; and, it might have been added, in some verses twice over!

our last number ; we should fill a whole page with mere title-pages, if we were to recount the pamphlets which have appeared since ; and there is probably not one of them which does not give a sufficient—some of them give an overwhelming, crushing—answer to the whole volume. . . . What is the difficulty in his volume to which these pamphlets, to go no further, have not supplied a sufficient answer ? ”⁵³

Sometimes indeed, he answers himself ; and shews us Colenso answered by Colenso. Thus in his attempt to make it out that the “Book of Moses” was a forgery palmed off upon Josiah, by “the priest Hilkiah, and, possibly, Huldah, and one or two others,”⁵⁴ he says first⁵⁵—“The High Priest ‘finds’ this Book of the Law in the Temple. If it really had been written by Moses, where, we must ask, had it been lying all this while, during more than eight centuries ? ” And then, four pages after, he answers his own question :—“Perhaps in the time of Josiah’s idolatrous father, the roll of the Pentateuch had disappeared. It may have been lying, little heeded, among the archives of the Temple, and so came into the hands of the successive High Priests, until it reached those of Hilkiah himself.”

Sometimes he answers by demolishing the German criticism on which he himself is building :⁵⁶—always taking good care however, to avoid grappling with the replies of his opponents. Dr. Biber’s challenge is admitted, by Dr. Colenso’s silence, to be unanswered because unanswerable. The Bishop appeals to the laity, and not in vain ; for it is from the laity, and in lay fashion, that he has received several of the most effective answers.⁵⁷ The blasphemy about Midian, and that which degrades the Very God of Very God, to the level of an ordinarily pious Jew, will be noticed in their proper place. Mean-

⁵³ The Christian Observer: 1863, p. 234.

⁵⁴ The Pentateuch Examined : Part III pp. 422—424.

⁵⁵ Ibid. p. 416.

⁵⁶ Ibid. p. 589. “Knobel’s account of the matter is not at all satisfactory.” “The very ground

on which Knobel’s opinion rests, is gone from under him” (p. 594). “Bleek has been obliged to abandon this view” (p. 596), and has now taken up another, which Dr. Colenso holds to be equally incorrect.

⁵⁷ As a single example we may mention “The Mosaic Origin of

time, enough has been said to show that his "Difficulties" rest on "doubtful premises, unwarranted assumptions, defective information, and even on what, in ordinary men, would be considered want of common sense." "Such difficulties, resting on such slender foundations, would not affect the historic character of any ancient writing, much less of that wonderful Book whose genuineness is attested by an unbroken series of Hebrew writers, and avouched by the infallible testimony of the Son of God."⁵⁸

Of difficulties whose solution is furnished by information flowing from other sources, that pertaining to Philippi in Macedonia affords a good example. St. Luke in relating the first introduction of Christianity into Europe (Ac. xvi. 12,) speaks of Philippi as the chief city of that part of Macedonia, and a colony; and in verse 21 implies that it was a Roman colony. The silence of contemporary profane history⁵⁹ as to this fact rendered it a difficulty even to the learned, and threw the suspicion of inaccuracy upon Luke's narrative, especially as the ancient metropolis of Macedonia Prima was known to have been Amphipolis. Some, to remove the difficulty, have preferred, with Michaelis, to translate *πρώτη* not as in the Authorised Version, "the chief," but "a chief" city. And this translation, from the absence of the article is of course perfectly warrantable. Boothroyd who takes this course says expressly, "this rendering is adopted as it is doubtful whether Philippi or Amphipolis was accounted the chief city of that part, &c." But the discovery of some ancient coins has dissipated the entire difficulty and confirmed the verbal accuracy of the Inspired Record. From the inscriptions on these coins, still extant,⁶⁰ it is certain that Philippi was made a Roman colony by Julius Caesar; and after the great battle fought there its privileges were renewed and augmented by Augustus. Now, as Spanheim

the Pentateuch considered," (Skeffington,) "by a Layman of the Church of England;" a worthy sequel to its predecessor, "The Historic Character of the Pentateuch considered."

⁵⁸ Dr. Mc. Caul's Examination: pp. 154, 156.

⁵⁹ Although Pliny calls it a colony (H. N. IV, 18).

⁶⁰ Vide Spanheim de usu Num. Diss. IX.

justly observes, it was part of the Roman policy to make their colonies the chief cities of the districts in which they were placed ; if therefore Philippi was not previously the larger and more populous city, it may readily be imagined how by the planting of the colony there it would become so. Nor is this mere supposition. For in confirmation of it, Strabo, who mentions Philippi several times, takes not the slightest notice of Amphipolis ; and so remarkably sunk and decayed was it some ages after, that in an old *Notitia Ecclesiastica* it is thrust down to the twenty-second place even of Macedonia Prima.

Somewhat similar, but until a recent period, much more perplexing, was the discrepancy between the account which Daniel gives of the fall of the Babylonian monarchy, and that which is furnished by Berosus, a Chaldee historian who wrote in the early part of the third century before Christ, and fragments of whose writing are preserved in Josephus ; as well as by Abydenus a later writer, some portions of whose works have been transmitted to us by Eusebuis. Daniel states that Belshazzar the *last* of the Babylonian kings was put to death on the night of that impious banquet, of which in his book we have such a vivid description. Berosus and Abydenus, on the other hand, tell us that the last king of Babylon, whom they call by a different name, was not slain at all, but after being besieged by Cyrus in the fortress of Borsippa, had Caramania assigned him by the conqueror as his residence, and, according to Abydenus, was appointed its govenor.

The chronic difficulty therefore as to the Belshazzar of the Bible, was where to place him, and to settle who he was. The last native king in the Canon, was Nabinnidochus, Nabonnedus, or Labynetus. But there was no such name in the Bible, and this was the more remarkable as the names which are found there usually bear a close resemblance to the names on the Chaldean monuments. The Rationalists, with their usual rashness, began to say that the whole story of Belshazzar was an invention of the prophet. Sir Isaac Newton had recourse to two falls of Babylon ; and different authors identified Belshazzar with different native kings. Thus e.g. by Josephus⁶¹

⁶¹ Ant. L.X. c. 11.

he is said to be the same as Naboandelus, the Nabonadius of Ptomey, and the Labynetus of Herodotus (L. 1.) But it is not by any mere cutting of the knot that the difficulty has at last been entirely removed. Col. Rawlinson in 1854, from documents obtained at Mugheir the ancient Ur of the Chaldees, has discovered that Nabonadius, the last king of the Canon, associated with himself, his son, *Bil-shar-uzur*, and allowed him the royal title. Thus Daniel's account is cleared of all difficulty, and corroborated in every particular. Nabonadius was indeed absent at Borsippa when Babylon was taken ; and Belshazzar, instead of being the myth with which the scorners had begun to make merry, is seen to be the veritable reality which Daniel has described.

This association of the son with the father in the regal power was a common occurrence in ancient monarchies ; and the recollection of this fact will suffice to dissipate many seeming difficulties in the books of Kings and Chronicles. Thus Jotham who reigned sixteen years alone, appears to have reigned also for four years previously, with his father Uzziah who was a leper.⁶² The same principle reconciles Je. xxv. 1, with Da. i. 1. For Jeremiah's statement that the fourth year of Jehoiakim was the first of Nebuchadnezzar, is strictly correct according to the Jewish mode of computing his reign from the time of his being associated with his father (Nabopolassar) in the empire, before he set out on his Syrian expedition to chastise the ambition of Pharaoh Necho. But the Babylonians do not reckon his reign to have begun until two years afterwards, when upon his father's death he succeeded to the sole government.

Again, Jewish historians speak of the reign of a king which is continued through one whole year and parts of two others,

⁶² Notwithstanding that Grotius —clarum et venerabile nomen— says (on 2 Ki. xv. 30) “*Vigesimo anno Joathan* : i.e. ex quo regnare cœperat Joathan ; non enim regnavit Joathan nisi annos sedecim.”

But the distinct and repeated statements found both in the history of the Kings and in the Chronicles (2 Ki. xv. 5 ; 2 Ch.

xxvi. 21), and especially the distinction observed in both places between Jotham's being “over the king's house, judging the people of the land,” [during his father's lifetime,] and the formal period “when he began to reign” [after his father's decease], seem fully to warrant a different conclusion.

as a three years reign.⁶³ It may be two years and ten months, or it may be one year and two months. They sometimes set down the principal number only ; the odd, or smaller number being omitted, as in Judges xx. 35 : see verse 46.

It not unfrequently happens too that different modes of reckoning are adopted by different writers in reference to the same transaction. Thus in Ge. xlvi. 26, 27, it is said that all the souls that went with Jacob into Egypt (not including his sons' wives) were sixty-six,⁶⁴ or (adding Jacob, Joseph and his two sons) seventy. This is repeated in Deuteronomy x. But Stephen, in Ac. vii. 14, says that Joseph sent and called Jacob and all his kindred, seventy-five persons. This last includes the nine wives of Jacob's sons (for Simeon's wife was probably dead at this time, Judah's was certainly so, and Joseph's was already in Egypt). These nine added to the sixty-six, make the seventy-five mentioned in the Acts. These passages were long supposed to involve a contradiction.⁶⁵

Comparing Ezra ii. and Neh. vii. we find that 42,360 persons returned from Babylon, of whom the numbers of the tribes of Benjamin and Judah, and of the priests, are given. The numbers in Nehemiah amount to 31,089 ; in Ezra to 29,818. Add to Nehemiah's number 494 names, mentioned only in Ezra ; and to Ezra's, 1,765 names, mentioned only in Nehemiah ; the results agree—31,583. The difference 10,777 represents the number of persons belonging to other tribes.⁶⁶ Yet this apparent discrepancy was long regarded as an objection to the narrative.

⁶³ A mode of reckoning which is said to be current among the Chinese to this day.

⁶⁴ i.e. sixty-four sons and grandsons ; one daughter, Dinah : and one granddaughter, Serah.

⁶⁵ Of other solutions which have been proposed, the most plausible is that of Dr. Hammond and many others, who think that Stephen quoted from the Septuagint of Gen. xlvi., where the number is three score and fifteen, for the LXX expressly include a son and

grandson of Manasseh, two sons and a grandson of Ephraim : but as these were certainly not born when Joseph sent for his father and kindred, the solution given above appears preferable. Of merely conjectural emendations, a favorable specimen may be seen in Grotius *in loc.*

⁶⁶ Dr. Angus's "Bible Handbook;" a most valuable work, for the publication of which the Rel. Tr. Soc. abundantly deserves the gratitude of the church at large.

The lesson taught in such instances as these—and it is urged with all the force of an inevitable inference—is that instead of questioning the Divine Inspiration of Scripture it becomes us rather to suspect our own ignorance in the interpretation of it. Nor is this lesson less important with respect to the moral than to the critical difficulties which beset the path of Christian Certainty. Most of these, as we have already seen, so far from being originated in the Christian Scriptures are inherent in the very nature of things, and are anterior to all revelation. Dark shadows indeed they are which shut the heathen world in a hopeless gloom, and it is only he who escapes from their last vestiges still hovering around us that fully perceives their true nature. To such a one the truth is clear and unclouded. The obscurations are not shadows of the truth, but shadows of the ignorant and erring conceptions through which it is viewed; shadows projected upon the truth, from the opaque understanding of the observer; and consequently, shadows which can only disappear with the ignorance and error on which their existence depends.

Take, for example, that fundamental mystery, the existence of moral evil. How shall we explain this mournful fact if there be a God of infinite power and goodness? Surely either the power or the will to remove it must be wanting. If the power, then how can God be Almighty? If the will, then how can He be infinitely good? To this dilemma the infidel appeals with a kind of malicious joy, to warrant his own unbelief; and even the devout Christian is often afraid to trust himself in these deep waters, and while conscious of a doubt still unsatisfied, is tempted to stifle it, if possible, by a violent effort of the will. But in spite of these efforts, the doubt and perplexity still recur.

“When the faith of the Christian borrows the aid of reason to remove the darkness, it tends to lose itself in two opposite labyrinths, from which no outlet is found. In one direction we encounter the Manichean doctrine, that there are two original independent powers of Good and Evil, the Ormusd and Ahriman of Zend theology, which contend with balanced might for the dominion of the universe. In the other we meet a Christian fatalism, which only avoids the admission of an Evil

power, by introducing dualism into the bosom of the Godhead. The Supreme Sovereign is placed above the laws of righteousness, which he has implanted in the heart of his own creatures. Moral good and evil, happiness and misery, salvation and ruin, are viewed as alike the results of His arbitrary and sovereign will. Between the Scylla of Manichean heresy, and the deeper gulf of this blasphemous perversion of truth, which makes God himself the Author of all evil, how shall we guide the vessel of our reason in safety, so as not to make shipwreck of our faith ? How shall we avoid either limiting the Almighty power, or denying the spotless and perfect holiness, of the God whom our hearts adore ?”⁶⁷

These are grave questions ; and yet it is not too much to say that they admit of perfectly satisfactory answers.⁶⁸ For let us examine the true meaning of the expression “ Almighty Power.” “ Is it the power to do whatever is conceivable by the thoughts of men, or simply whatever is possible in its own nature ? Or do both definitions agree, so that every hypothesis capable of being propounded by the human faculties, is proved to be possible by that circumstance alone ? If the mind of man were perfect in knowledge, no conception it forms could ever involve contradictory elements. But this is not really the case. An ignorant and erring fancy may associate many things in words which are quite incompatible. The greater our ignorance, the wider must be the sphere of these illusions.” The child who has just learned the meaning of the word angle or triangle, may think it possible and easy to construct a three-sided figure, whose angles shall be greater or less than two right angles ; or to vary the dimensions of a right-angled triangle, so that the square on its hypotenuse shall exceed those on its sides by a definite quantity. The geometer knows that these problems are in their own nature impossible. They do not come within the province of Omnipotence to execute, but of Omniscience to discern their inherent contradiction. These examples—and they may be

⁶⁷ Birks.

⁶⁸ For a full consideration of this and kindred subjects the reader is referred to a masterly Essay—to which these pages are

largely indebted—by the Rev. T. R. Birks, on “ The Difficulties of Belief, in connexion with the Creation and the Fall.” (Cambridge : Macmillan and Co.)

drawn by thousands from the range of pure science alone—prove that many things are really contradictory and impossible, in which the eye of ignorance can see no contradiction whatever.

And similarly the theological and moral difficulties before us arise from the confused imaginings in which we have confounded the possible with the impossible. “All things are possible with God”—those things only excepted which imply a contradiction. Almighty as he is, He is yet “God, that *cannot* lie ;” “He *cannot* deny himself ;” He “*cannot* be tempted with evil.” The Judge of all the earth *cannot* do wrong. He *cannot* reverse his own essential perfections. His name is I AM, and He *cannot* cease to be, by an act of will. He *cannot* create another God, equal to himself ; He *cannot* give His own glory to another, nor make any creature that shall not be essentially and eternally subject to his own dominion, dependent on the Great First Cause, and obedient, either in act or obligation, to the Supreme Lawgiver. His name is Love, and He *cannot* become hatred. His name is God the Only Wise, and He *cannot* be deceived. He is the true Light, and all darkness and shadow must be perpetually without his all-perfect Being ; and to suppose Him capable, by an act of His own will, of introducing them into that Holy of holies, is not less a contradiction than a lying blasphemy.

“God could, doubtless, convert and save all men and all devils, but He has wise reasons for not doing it.” These words of a popular commentator furnish a fair specimen of the popular illusions we are now considering. We shall do well to suspect the truth of those assertions that need to be buttressed with a “doubtless.” We may admit the force of the “doubtless” when we have seen the proof. But in this case the proof lies the other way. The Almighty himself can act upon his creatures only in conformity with the nature of the being He has himself bestowed. Atoms or worlds may be transported by his Almighty fiat from place to place with the speed of lightning ; but they *cannot* be impressed by arguments, allured by promises, or terrified by warnings. On the other hand, conscious spirits must be open to every variety of moral suasion ; but they *cannot* be the subject of merely mechanical impulses, like unconscious matter ; and must be acted upon, so far as we can comprehend,

even by their Creator himself, in strict agreement with the essential laws of spiritual being. Scripture and Reason unite to prove that moral agents can be ruled only by moral influence, and that mechanism, compulsion, and mere physical constraint, are means incompatible with the essential laws of their nature ; means which Almighty Power cannot, and Infinite Wisdom refuses to employ ; so that the supposition that such remedies can avail when all others have failed, is nothing else than a mischievous delusion.

But it may be said, If the evil is so hard to be remedied, why was it not prevented ? And in reply it is sufficient to ask, How could it be prevented ? It is the teaching of Scripture not less than the dictate of reason, which leads us to believe that the prevention of all evil, in a world of created free agents, may be strictly impossible in its own nature. Matter, in receiving active power, receives a law which it must implicitly obey. Obedience to the ordinance of the Creator is the necessity of its being. But it is not so with moral agents. The power of choice, the faculty of reason, the gift of will, imply a higher and more responsible mode of existence. Created in the image of God himself, and reflecting the spontaneity of the Divine Will, they are not His tools, but His subjects and stewards. They have a trust committed to them, and a law they are bound, but not necessitated to obey. It is this liberty of choice, this immunity from passive and compulsory subjection to a law which enforces itself and must be fulfilled, which constitutes their peculiar dignity, as the highest and noblest of all the works of God.

Nor is this fact at all modified by any merely metaphysical speculations on the nature of free-will. It is the very constitution of a moral and reasonable being, or free agent, to have been created in the image of God. The will of such a creature is neither undetermined, which would resign the dominion of the world to chance, nor necessitated and constrained by outward circumstances, which would equally establish the supremacy of a blind and inevitable fate. It is strictly self-determined. Circumstances and motives persuade, but do not compel. There is a real liberty, but it is not the liberty of pure indifference, or the power of deciding without any motive

and reason whatever. The self which determines is the deep and hidden ground of the creature's whole being ; and as it is good or evil, decides the weight of the motives themselves, and the practical result of the circumstances out of which they arise. When we say the will has chosen good or evil, because such was its own character, we have gone as deep as it is possible for us to go ; and whatever would persuade us to refer its choice, either to the necessity of circumstances without, or a capricious, uncaused, and unaccountable impulse within, is a falsehood which deadens the conscience, and tends to undermine all the foundations of moral government.

We are thus shut up to the conclusion that moral evil has neither been positively decreed, nor negatively permitted, but simply foreseen, by the God of infinite holiness, who cannot behold it without an intense abhorrence ; that its entrance is an inseparable result of the creation of free moral agents ; and is the object of foresight to the Omniscient Wisdom, though not of prevention even by Almighty Power ; but that having been foreseen, infinite power, wisdom, and love have conspired to provide a wonderful remedy ; so that where sin hath abounded, grace will much more abound, and death shall at last be swallowed up in a glorious victory. Two main principles are thus established. First, that the entrance of moral evil is due entirely to the mutable will of the creature, and in no respect to the decree of the Almighty, or even to that active permission which consists in the voluntary withholding of some needful and possible succour. And secondly, that the foresight of its first entrance, and all the awful results that have followed, are no sufficient reason why God should have forborne the highest and noblest exercise of His creative power : since evil would then have achieved a more fatal triumph, in the bare contemplation of it as possible, than now in its actual entrance and reign. The Uncreated Life would have been sealed up perpetually within its hidden fountain. God would have been defrauded of His glory, and the universe of its being.

For every creature of God, called out of nothing by His almighty power, is like a planet in the sun-light, with one hemisphere of natural good, and another of natural evil. As born of God, it is simply and purely good ; as born out of

nothingness, it is purely and simply evil. But this evil, in the first state of creation, is not the same with impurity or moral guilt. In natural things, it is simply defect, or the essential limitation of their being. In moral agents, it is defectibility as well as limitation, and includes the possibility of abusing the power of choice, that highest gift of the bountiful Creator. Every creature, as soon as created, casts from it a shadow on the side opposite to the True Sun. From the very fact of its existence there result inevitably many possibilities of evil. No simple act, even of Almighty Power, can set aside this eternal truth. But it is the very province of Infinite Wisdom to dispose, over-rule, and control all the creatures Omnipotence has made ; and recognising the unalterable contrast of light and darkness, of moral good and evil, so to unfold it before the eyes of the moral universe, that the unfallen may be maintained in their sinless purity ; and the fallen and rebellious either recovered to purity again, or compelled, while enduring the righteous judgment of the Most High, to manifest, through eternal ages, the height and depth of His victorious goodness.

PART II.

D O U B T S.

CHAPTER III.

“Like polluting vices, doubts also leave their scars behind.”

CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.

DOES Belief in Christianity involve Belief in the Bible? Is the verity of the Christian Religion inseparable from the veracity of the Christian Scriptures? It is a question full of interest and importance; for this reason if for no other, it is so often put. And it is put too by persons whose “standing-points” are directly opposed to one another. It is put wistfully by some who while perplexed by (what are called) the difficulties of the Bible, yet find it impossible to abandon their confidence in that religion which the Bible reveals. And it is put maliciously and covertly by others who know full well the fundamental character of the Bible, and who consequently strain every nerve to carry by a process of sapping and mining, the citadel which seems but more impregnable after every fresh assault. Nor is it strange that, seen through such diverse media, the same subject should be presented under such diverse aspects. On the one hand it is undeniable that Christianity rests on certain fundamental facts; facts which would remain immovable if the Bible were annihilated to-morrow. On the other hand it is equally undeniable that the actual existence of the Bible (—not to speak of that accumulation of facts which forms its past history—) is itself one of those great facts which it is impossible to account for unless we admit its Divine character. A religion unwritten, a faith independent of “book-faith,” is certainly a conceivable thing; for aught we know it may even be a possible thing; but it is certainly not the actual thing with which we have to do. For the “eternal life” which “God hath given to us” “is in His Son:” but the Scriptures are the “Record” of that Son; the only, the

authentic record ; hence, for those who seek "eternal life," the only way is to "search the Scriptures," for there only can we find the witnesses who are competent to "testify" of Christ.

We conclude therefore that although conceivably separable, yet practically the two subjects are inseparable. There are certain facts which constitute the proper evidence of Revealed Religion. The investigation of those facts is perfectly distinct and separate from the criticism of its records. But though the two subjects are perfectly distinct, they are by no means independent. On the contrary, the criticism of the Christian Records has an important bearing upon the proper Christian evidences. If, for instance, in the course of this criticism we were to find the records confused and contradictory, though this would not necessarily invalidate the truth of the Christian doctrine, it would greatly alter the relation in which the Bible stands to that doctrine ; and if on the other hand, we found in the records proofs of divine superintendence and arrangement, we should properly bring this result in as an evidence of the Christian Religion. This distinction is not more real than important. Forgetfulness, or a willing oversight of it, has furnished scepticism with some of its most effective means of attack. Supposed inconsistencies in the record have been brought forward as disproving Christianity itself. Now we do not admit that there are such inconsistencies, but we allege that, if there were, they would modify—not the doctrine of Christianity itself—but merely our view of the relation in which the record stands to that doctrine. An illustration may serve perhaps not only to make this more clear, but also to mark out more precisely the proper limits of Biblical Criticism.

Suppose there had come down to us from distant ages and from various quarters, accounts in writing of some medicine—some *elixir vitae*—which when used according to the directions given, would prevent or cure all diseases to which the human frame is liable. We should all be anxious to know what this medicine really is, and how it is to be received. "But the documents containing the account of it are in foreign tongues, they can be read only by the learned, they do not all contain the same precise information respecting the elixir ; but

some speak of it more obscurely, and some more plainly. They have been transmitted with care, yet still there is a variety of differences in the written accounts which profess to give the very same treatise on it. From the fame of the medicine imitations have sprung up, and false accounts have been transmitted to us along with the true. It is clear that these accounts should be received with caution. We must not be too credulous, or we shall be cheated into receiving some spurious compound instead of the true specific. We must not be too sceptical, or we may miss the advantage altogether. What then should be our course? Plainly this. In the first place we ought to inquire into the truth of the alleged virtue of the medicine. If on good evidence we are convinced that it is altogether a mere piece of quackery, there is an end of the matter: we concern ourselves no more about it. But unless we are so *convinced*, prudence dictates at least further inquiry. We have then to examine the records which profess to give an account of the remedy. Now in doing this, how are we to proceed? Our first inquiry must be, Are these records, or any of them, *genuine*?—that is, do they come from those from whom they profess to come? Then, are they *authentic*?—that is, do they contain a true account of what they profess to give an account of? And when we have proceeded thus far, and have found that some of these accounts are both genuine and authentic, setting the others completely aside (except so far as they may serve to illustrate those we have selected), we proceed to a more careful examination of these. They will form our *canonical* accounts. But we must not stop here. For, first, we have to settle what is the *true text* of the documents; then we must determine how their meaning is to be ascertained; then to compare the views given by one with those given by another, that we may have an accurate knowledge of the whole subject. But it is clear that the greater number of those who might be benefited by the medicine cannot undertake all this labour and research. Are they then to be left to any empiric who professes to have the true elixir, and to make no inquiry for themselves? Certainly not. The wise and reasonable course is for them to follow the guidance of those who are in a condition to investigate these matters—to ascertain the results to which they

come—and, if they believe their guides to be honest and competent, they will feel that it is not yielding themselves to be blind-folded and led they know not whither, if they take the path such guides point out. When, however, different guides present themselves, all affirming that they know the right way ; and when moreover, there are not wanting those who tell them to trust to none of these, for all are alike deceivers ; it becomes them to adopt such means as they can to ascertain the trustworthiness of those who offer to conduct them. How can this be done better than by being informed of the principles on which these guides have come to the conclusions which they present to them ? For most men who have any curiosity about the matter will feel, that if they have not the time or attainments to follow the detail of the various arguments, they are quite competent to determine the validity of the principles on which the arguments are conducted. Some too, and perhaps not a few, will think that if they had given to them a simple account of these matters, so that they might really see what they are apt to lose sight of amidst the multiplicity of detail involved in arguments and counter arguments on minute points, they might be able hereafter to make some progress for themselves in the investigation of matters which now seem to be quite beyond their reach.”¹ Some such account—though brief yet clear—may be attempted in this place. The great facts which stamp the Christian evidence with the character of absolute certainty, will be noticed in their proper place presently. In this chapter however, we are concerned only with those subordinate topics which admit an element of uncertainty and doubt.

We see then that our subject embraces first the Books of Scripture, and secondly the Contents of those Books : the Genuineness, Authenticity and Canonical Authority of the former ; the Determination and Interpretation of the latter. Our illustration fails, however, in one important particular. We have not supposed that the knowledge of the medicine was communicated by God—that it was a Revelation. But in the case before us, if the Bible be at all what it professes to be, it

¹ Journal of Sac. Lit. vol. v, p. 416.

contains a message from God to man. It has been revealed, and those who revealed it must have received it from God ; i.e. they were inspired. The last and highest point therefore to which we come is, Inspiration. And we place this last because it is clear that we must be acquainted with the mode in which the message is conveyed before we can gain any correct notion of the mode or degree of inspiration of those who conveyed it.

The topics before us then, may be regarded as forming three pairs : let us place them side by side.

BOOKS OF SCRIPTURE.

Genuineness
Authenticity
Canonicity

CONTENTS OF THE BOOKS.

Integrity
Meaning
Inspiration

First, we have the genuineness of the book and the purity of the text ; or (in other words) Is it the work of the author to whom it is assigned, and what precisely did he write ? Secondly, the authenticity of the book, and the interpretation of the text ; or, Is the book trustworthy, and what did the writer mean ? And thirdly, the canonical authority of the book, and the inspiration of the text ; or, Is the book part of the canon of Scripture, and what is its authority as such ? To take an illustration, the Acts of the Apostles, for example. If we would pursue the investigation thoroughly we must inquire first whether the alleged author (Luke) is really the actual author, whether it is a real and not a fictitious narrative, and whether it is received by Christians in general as canonical. Then, further, we should have to inquire how we are to ascertain what Luke really did write, how we are to come at the meaning of what he wrote, and to what extent or in what degree his narrative is to be held as authoritative in the highest sense, that is, inspired. To attempt in its minute details the elaboration of this inquiry with respect to each individual book of the Bible is obviously, in a short summary like the present, as incompatible with its limits as foreign to its purpose. Nor is it necessary. It has been done already ; done often, done well : so often as to make the repetition superfluous, and so well as to be perfectly conclusive. Still, an outline sketch may be not

unserviceable, especially if, in pursuance of our special topic, we give prominence chiefly to those points which are deemed most suggestive of DOUBT.

To begin then at the beginning. For the genuineness, authenticity, and canonicity of the Old Testament we have the highest of all testimony, that of our Lord Himself.² He recognises the threefold division of it existing in His time. He quotes from it as from an authority replete with the instruction of unerring wisdom. He appeals to it as to the final arbiter of all controversies. He accepts it as a testimony concerning Himself—of whom not only David and the Prophets, but even Moses in the Law did write—and attests the fact that in virtue of that testimony it contains eternal life. To this testimony of the Master may be added that of His disciples, the Apostles and Evangelists, whose narratives, few and brief and varied as they are, contain no less than two hundred and sixty-three direct quotations, besides three hundred and seventy-six references to the same (Old Testament) Scriptures. Nor is it irrelevant to cite the evidence of Jews who were not Christians. The Son of Sirach, B.C. 130, mentions the threefold division; so also does Philo, A.D. 41, quoting from all but nine. Josephus³ enumerates them according to their classes, including all the present books. His testimony, not more from its own nature than from its author's position and character, is particularly valuable.

² And let it not be thought if we adduce other testimony in addition to His, that we adduce it in *support* of it. When He has spoken there is no room for question, except as to the meaning of His words. It may give certainty to our conclusion as to that meaning in the present instance if we remember that “the tradition that Moses was the author of all the Pentateuch, as it now stands, is one found in all subsequent Jewish writings, in all uncanonical writings, in all the

writings of the cotemporaries of our Lord. It was an element in the national faith in His days. He who spake as never man spake gave it his sanction. In the language of all His countrymen he called Moses the author of the Pentateuch, and *they* meant that he was the author of all the Pentateuch. We cannot doubt the meaning of the Lord Himself. To us it is plain and inevitable.”

³ Born at Jerusalem, A.D. 37; died at Rome A.D. 95.

"We have not," says he "myriads of books discordant and disagreeing, but only two and twenty books, containing the history of all time, which are justly believed to be divine. And of these, five are those of Moses, which contain both the laws and the account of the human race from its origin to his death. This period is but little less than three thousand years. And from the death of Moses to the reign of Artaxerxes, the successor of Xerxes, King of the Persians, the prophets who succeeded Moses wrote the transactions of their times in thirteen books ; and the other four contain hymns to God, and practical counsels for men. And from the time of Artaxerxes to our own days everything has been written, but these accounts have not been deemed worthy of the same credit as those which preceded them, because the succession of the prophets was not certain. And how greatly we trust to our own writings is manifest by facts ; for though so long a period has now passed by, no one has dared either to add or to take away anything from them, or to alter them ; indeed it is implanted in all Jews from their very birth, to regard these as the commands of God, and to continue in them ; and for them, if needful, willingly to die." *

Of Christian writers, Melito, Bishop of Sardis, A. D. 177, mentions all the books of our present canon except Esther and Lamentations. Origen (230) mentions all without exception. So does Cyril of Jerusalem (348) ; as also the Council of Laodicea, 363 ; Epiphanius, 368 ; and Hilary of Poictiers, 370. These are Greek authorities.

Of Latin authorities, the chief are Jerome, 392 ; Ruffin, 397 ; the third Council of Carthage, 397 ; and Augustine, 395 ; and all agree in enumerating the whole.

We need go no further. The Old Testament now in our hands is the same book that existed in the time of our Lord. It comprises the same portions by the same writers—not one less, not one more ; and it needs no argument to prove that the warrant so ample for its reception, then, is not less ample for its reception now.

So strong indeed is the case in favor of these ancient writings felt to be, that until very recently the adverse criticism of

* Joseph. con. Apion I. 8.

modern times has directed all its force to the overthrowing the credibility not of the Old Testament but of the New. Some have seized on the trivial variations of the Evangelists, and pompously paraded them, as if it were not a characteristic of truth to find substantial agreement amidst circumstantial variety. Others, with a profound contempt for petty details, and a profound confidence in the dogmatism of their own undoubting genius have sought to distinguish themselves by asserting that the New Testament history is mythical, and that that Divine Person on whom the government of the world devolves is Himself a myth. These vagaries, and such as these, decked out with "great swelling words" have had their day. They no longer offend the public eye; and he who would now examine them must search for them as he would for any other monstrosities, in the cabinets of the curious. It has been found that the historic evidence in favor of the New Testament is perfectly invincible. And with this discovery the tactics of our assailants have been changed. The Old Testament is the foundation of the New. What readier way of subverting the superstructure than by undermining the foundation? And this can surely not be so very difficult. It will be no easy matter—if even it be possible—to cite in favor of Moses that plaguy host of concurrent testimony which has established the credibility of Paul or John. At all events, one thing is plain: failure here is failure everywhere; and if we cannot move the Old Testament we can move nothing. Our antagonists are perfectly right in this matter. They have chosen their ground well. We give them credit for their discernment. We accept the challenge; and we have no fear for the issue.

The grand subject of the long series of critical assaults which we now proceed to notice is, the unity of the Pentateuch; i.e. its primal and elementary unity, and so its Mosaic authorship. The centre of this critical tornado, round which, in its onward ravages, it ever whirls, is found in the different divine names. It has long been noticed⁵ as a remarkable fact that two very

⁵ It was conjectured by Vitringa that prior documents had been incorporated in Genesis. The physician Astrue (Professor of Medicine at Paris; died 1766) first fastened on the divine names

different words are used in Genesis and the first six chapters of Exodus, for God, and that after a certain passage in Exodus, which seems to afford an etymological explanation of one of them and of its origin that one becomes predominant. It is remarkable too that in the first chapter of Genesis, and first four verses of the second, the name of God is *Elohim*; in the second and third chapters *Jehovah-Elohim* (in the mouth of the historian); in the fourth chapter and onward, sometimes *Jehovah* and sometimes *Elohim*. These facts were early observed and early gave rise to speculation. The theories more recently started to account for them are very many, and for the most part, very absurd. They possess in common however, one fundamental position, viz., that the use of the divine names is explicable by assuming a variety of sources.

The main arguments for the disintegration are these. First, these same divine names, coupled with the passage in Exodus, "but by my name Jehovah was I not known to them," which seems to imply that the name *Jehovah* was first revealed to Moses in the wilderness, and was until then unknown; and the fact corroborative of this view, that immediately after this passage the name *Jehovah* becomes almost exclusive.

as giving a clue to the component elements. He supposed that besides the Elohistic and Jehovahistic, Moses had the aid of ten minor documents. But as it is not very difficult to earn distinction when distinction is the result of guessing, the tribe of guessers was speedily and largely multiplied. So Astruc's idea was elaborated by Eichhorn, and dignified as the "Document Hypothesis." Then it was corrupted, and in the hands of Vater and Hartmann became the "Fragment Hypothesis." But this corruption speedily issued in a reaction by which the "Document" was elevated into the "Supplement Hypothesis." The last phase of the Kaleidoscope

presents another reaction. This is against the "Supplement Hypothesis;" and Ewald and Hupfeld are its chief promoters. It may afford a faint idea of the unbridled character of these speculations, to mention the principal points in Ewald's *present* theory. According to him the Pentateuch rose out of the following chaos:—

1. Book of Covenants; at the base of which lay other (!) works: time of Samson.
2. Book of originals.
3. The prophetic narrators—three of them.
4. The Deuteronomist.
5. And 5th, by the insertion of this last work, the "crystallization" of the Pentateuch as we now have it.

Second, in many passages in Genesis there seem to be traces of two streams of somewhat different colour, running now in one channel but refusing completely to coalesce. Slight discrepancies are said to occur ; the same story is twice narrated ; different religious views are taken of the same occurrence ; an incident is made to fall in with other incidents, and with the whole course of things differently ; a certain philosophy of history is visible in one portion of the narrative, not visible in the other, thus suggesting the complicity of two authors, one of whom had a different intellectual and religious culture from the other. Third, we find in various passages a variety of style and expression corresponding to this variety of religious view ; the style of one part is broad and dilated, of another, compact and terse.

Now the answer to all this is very simple. The alleged distinctions such as they are, are not sufficient to maintain the theory. That the Pentateuch does actually combine two elements thus distinct has indeed been abundantly asserted, but it still remains "not proven." We ask for proof ; and nothing less than proof will satisfy us ; not even the credit of that superior cleverness which affects to see (if not to make) those fine distinctions on which depend the allegations of an unproved and therefore worthless theory. Granted, that the same event is sometimes mentioned more than once : What then ? O ! but it is mentioned under different aspects. Of course it is : why else should it be mentioned again at all ? And may not these different aspects be owing to different surrounding circumstances ? Can you imagine no other (not to say no better) way of accounting for them than by inventing a fictitious author ?

Let me illustrate my meaning by an example.⁶ Hupfeld, one of the most prominent of recent assailants of the Pentateuch, discovers therein the work of three separate authors, and of an editor who had all their materials in his hands and who used them freely. "He measures the Pentateuch by modern

⁶ It is taken from that vol. of "Horne's Introduction" which was last year "Revised and Edited" | by the Rev. John Ayre, M.A." London: Longmans.

usage, and would cramp its free narrative by mechanical line and rule. A notable example of this is to be found in Gen. xlviij. ; where besides other objections to the plain touching history, he especially stumbles at verse 7. 'And as for me, when I came from Padan, Rachel died by me in the land of Canaan in the way, when yet there was but a little way to come unto Ephrath : and I buried her there in the land of Ephrath : the same is Bethlehem.'

"Jacob, whatever were his faults, and the sacred writer does not disguise them, was a man of affectionate temper. His thoughts were bound up with his beloved Rachel, and with the sons she bore him. Her image when he had lost her was ever before his eyes ; and her children, as they grew up in his house, while they solaced, yet saddened his heart, making more pungent the remembrance of her he had so much loved. And, when he saw those sons' sons, when he was restored to Joseph, whose face he never thought to see again, and beheld his children, when too, as he looked, though with failing eyes, upon them, his last sickness was warning him that he also must go whither Rachel had gone before, and when he was lifting up his hands to bless the lads—what wonder if thick-coming thoughts of the sad scene of Rachel's death, and the place of her burial, rose vividly before him, and there dropped from his lips once again the story of his bereavement, ere, mastering his emotion, he uttered the prophetic blessing ? There is not a passage in the Pentateuch more true to nature, or which touches more thrillingly the chords of human feeling. But Dr. Hupfeld is insensible to all this. He thinks that Jacob ought to have spoken in such a moment, as if he were writing a political despatch—in set phrases, and regular order, and with cold precision. Dr. Hupfeld seems to have no notion of what the bursting heart may prompt and the ready lips express. And so, because this verse is not where he would have put it himself, it does not suit, he says, the mouth of Jacob, 'because nothing follows of it.' And he calls it 'a gloss.'

" If Scripture is to be treated in this way, anything may be made of it, nay, there is scarcely a book in existence which a critic, working after this fashion, may not dismember by rule, and sort out and ticket into innumerable fragments which he

thinks he can reconstruct far better than the writer. More symmetrical, perhaps, it might be ; but the life and the reality would be gone."

But while we thus maintain that the distinction of the Pentateuch into two separate portions is not such as is alleged, we now proceed to add that even if it were we should have no objection. The theory before us is obviously in no respect incompatible with the doctrine of plenary inspiration. That doctrine concerns the present form of Scripture alone. Scripture may embody any amount of previously existing matter ; may draw, as in certain cases (e.g. Ezra's) it has done, even from heathen archives ; Daniel's narrative may interweave a Chaldean decree, and Luke's the genealogical tables of his countrymen ; yet this in no way interferes with the doctrine of Inspiration. And therefore, the general thesis, that Genesis or the Pentateuch is composed of documents two or ten or any other number, one set of which has used the name Elohim, and another set the name Jehovah, is one to which no theory of inspiration can object. Wherever these documents came from, and whatever their usage may have been, they have by divine contrivance been drawn within the bounds of Scripture—and all Scripture is given by inspiration of God.

But thirdly, there is an instructive significance in the Scripture usage of the Divine Names : a significance in the development of which Hengstenberg has done much, but Kurtz has done more. "If we would not remain in vagueness altogether indeterminate, we must call in the aid of another name. What has confused the head of criticism for generations on this question is the delusion that Elohim and Jehovah are opposed to each other. Scripture gives no countenance to the delusion. It contrasts El Shaddai (God Almighty) and Jehovah." The famous passage in Exodus runs thus :—"I appeared to your fathers in (my character of) Elshaddai, but in (the character of) my name Jehovah was I not known by them." Elshaddai and Jehovah are contrasted here. Elohim is really the general, of which these are two species. These two words express two eras in the development of the divine. Under the one, God appeared as Almighty, as a Being who can do what He wills or promises, (or to use Kurtz's expression) as unlimited

potency. Under the other, He appears as the Being who *will* do what He promises. The former name described God chiefly by His physical attributes—power, and the rest; Jehovah, chiefly by His personal attributes—grace, mercy, the covenant-keeping God. This name expresses God as entering into personal religious relation with men, and ever affording them nearer and clearer manifestations of Himself.

Fourthly. This binary theory appears in its true character as a dwarfish piece of patch-work, when opposed to the Real Unity of the Pentateuch. For that such a real unity does distinguish that work is now admitted on all hands—Hupfeld not excepted. It is admitted that Moses, besides being the author of Deuteronomy, is the author of all the Pentateuchal legislation; and that all the legislative portions of the Pentateuch cohere. Can we doubt that this coherence is due to a single author? or that that author is also the author of the historic couch in which this legislation is imbedded? Ewald is “not of us;” yet Ewald finely says—and Tholuck approves the saying—that the gospel of the Old Testament lies in Exod. xix. 6: “Ye shall be unto me a Kingdom of priests, and a holy nation.” This idea of a Kingdom of God, a theocracy, is the ruling idea in the Pentateuch. This idea, the prophetic adumbration of it, the historic preparation for it, the legislative determination of it, the religious conception of it, forms the Pentateuch. The tabernacle of God is with men—the meaning of that, and the means for it, really exhaust the five books. The Pentateuch forms the severest unity. It consists of a theocratic constitution (given in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers); the preparation for this constitution (in Genesis); and an exposition of its spiritual significance (in Deuteronomy). Without the succeeding legislation and theocratic life embodying it, Genesis is an incomprehensible abortion. It is a genesis of what after all was never generated. It is a series of beginnings which never come to an end. Without the following books it resembles a path in a wood which we follow some distance in the hope of finding it terminate in the main road, when suddenly it becomes lost and overgrown, and we wander about in vain and helpless search. The book begins sacrifice, begins Christology, begins theocratic tabernacling of God with

men, begins the law, begins every thing and ends nothing ; and if we had not the end elsewhere, we should say Genesis was the most inconsequent production conceivable. But it is precisely of these beginnings, and of nothing else, that we find the issue and result in succeeding portions of the Pentateuch. Suppose that we had possessed the legislation of the later books, without the preceding history in Genesis, and the surrounding history in Exodus and Numbers : that legislation would then have been an historical riddle to us. The legislation is the harvest of which the seeds are sown in Genesis ; and the surrounding history is the field whereon the harvest waves. This history is not a thing independent of itself, and separable from the legislation, the two reciprocally affect each other. The history is given mainly to explain the legislation ; and much of the legislation is inserted in the historic couch, where it should naturally lie. Both in Genesis and Exodus, the author has taken the legislation as his starting point, and it is only the historic streams which empty themselves into it that he pursues ; in other words, the theocratic aim rules the whole history.

To conclude. “ With regard to the other marks of disintegration, such as different phraseology, views, &c., we do not think much of that sort has been substantiated. Very much is mere assertion ; very much is mere begging of the question, and rotatory reasoning, explaining the names by different sources, and proving different sources by the different names ; many of the results of one critic stand in unrelieved antithesis to those of another ; and some difference of view and phraseology in passages marked by the different divine names is to be looked for, for both the use of the names and the phraseology will depend on the subject. The only point on which criticism seems agreed is, that Elohim is due to one writer, and Jehovah to another ; all else is fluidity and contradiction. This is the only *result* ; around all else critics are battling like hungry wolves. This result, which after all is MERELY A CONJECTURE, was obtained long ago by Eichhorn. The unlikelihood of the theory, however, and the impassable straits to which we are reduced when we attempt to separate the documents or account for the mode of union, together with the fact that a far deeper and more becoming

explanation of the interchange of the names lies close to our hand, **COMPEL US TO REJECT THE THEORY IN EVERY FORM.** The shifts to which all critics are reduced to keep their theories together, would be contemptible if they were not ridiculous. Most of the critical houses keep an officer about them whom they call in this department the ‘supplementer’ or ‘redactor,’ whose duty it is to keep the theory in repair.”⁷

Next to Moses and the Pentateuch, there is perhaps no book of the Old Testament more remarkable, nor any writer more distinguished than—Daniel. Pourtraying, in a manner perfectly unique, the most prominent features of that grand historic interest which is concentrated on “the latter days,” this book stands to the rest of the Old Testament in a relation analogous to that sustained by the Apocalypse to the New. And it would even seem as if there had been reserved for this earlier prophecy some portion of that special benediction so emphatically pronounced upon those that “hear” and “keep” the words of the later one. Those who have most fully learned to appreciate the foreshadowings of “the beloved disciple,” have thereby approximated most nearly to that divine illumination of the understanding which alone can unseal the book of the “man greatly beloved.” Among the ancient fathers, the special commentaries of Jerome, Theodoret, and Hippolytus; among the great reformers, the expositions of Melancthon, *Œcolampadius*, and Calvin; among men of science, the illustrious Newton, and the scarcely less celebrated Locke; these and many others—ancient and modern witnesses—testify to the singular interest and attractiveness which, now as ever, continues to characterize this ever-fascinating book.

But, as was to be expected, this book of Daniel, with all the homage which men of the greatest ability have paid to it, has not escaped assault and opposition. From the very early ages of the Christian Church it has been made an object

⁷ These are the words of a Master in Israel; whose able exposition in the British and Foreign Ev. Review (Oct. 1861), besides laying the present writer

under personal obligations, cannot fail to be regarded with devout gratitude by all those who are set for the defence of the Gospel.

of special attack by unbelievers. And the reason is evident. To prove the authenticity of this one book, is to prove the divine origin of the whole system of which it forms a part. Either a miracle of omniscience is implied in its composition, or it is a forgery: and the direct intervention of Deity being thus demonstrated in connexion with *one* of the books of Scripture, the great controversy is decided, the grand fact established; God has spoken to man; and in the Bible we listen to His voice.

Infidelity, therefore, is compelled for its very existence, to impugn this book, and endeavour to subvert its authority. We find accordingly, that the attack has been renewed from age to age with determined pertinacity. But what has it achieved? "The higher criticism," with all its ingenuity, and after sixteen centuries of effort, has not succeeded in rendering the assertions of Porphyry one whit less untenable than ever. The pupil of Longinus achieved quite as much as the pupils of Lengerke; they have alike arrived at the same result; they have achieved nothing. It must be confessed however, that not a little plausibility can be given to some of their objections. There are a good many circumstances connected with the book of Daniel, which render an attack upon its genuineness more easy perhaps, and more likely to be successful, than in the case of any other of the books of Scripture. And accordingly it is not very uncommon to find, even in the higher and more respectable literature of our day, doubts insinuated or expressed regarding the authority and trustworthiness of the book of Daniel, without any intention on the writers' part of weakening the general evidence on which the Bible is received as the Word of God.

To this state of things, so far as our own country is concerned, there can be no doubt that the influence of the late Dr. Arnold has powerfully contributed. That large class of persons who care less for great arguments than for great names, take it for granted that a man so justly respected both for his scholarship and moral excellence, as Dr. Arnold, must have had the best reasons for avowing that opinion respecting the book of Daniel, with which his name is identified. Whereas, so far as appears, he had nothing of the sort. The only reason assigned for the

opinion so confidently expressed is the same with that of Porphyry of old ; and for anything like conclusive arguments we search in vain. But it has been well remarked by the English translator of Hengstenberg's "Dissertations on the Genuineness of Daniel," that the judgment of Dr. Arnold seems on this point to have been blinded by dogmatic prejudices. Arnold, like many others, had formed his own scheme of prophetic interpretation, and he found that some of the latter parts of the book of Daniel refused to harmonize with it. And hence, apparently, the readiness with which he pronounced against their genuineness. Every one who has watched his own mind in expounding Scripture, must have felt how great was the tendency to allow his own subjective notions to have a very undue influence in deciding the meaning which he attributed to particular passages. The instances, alas ! are not a few, in which pious commentators have been found on the point of openly quarrelling with certain statements of Inspiration, for no other reason than that these appeared to militate against their own scheme of interpretation. The modern Jewish disposition to depreciate the authority of Daniel, in order to evade the force of the verification of his prediction concerning the coming of the Messiah, is a case in point. It is sufficiently met, however, by the testimony of Josephus who, no doubt speaking the current opinion of his time, calls Daniel "one of the greatest of the prophets ; for he was wont not only to foretell future things, as other prophets also did, but likewise determined the time when they should come to pass."⁸ Every one knows how far this kind of feeling at one time carried Luther, with respect to the Epistle of James. Fancying that it was opposed to his great and precious doctrine of justification by faith alone, he denounced it as "epistola straminea," *a strawy epistle*. In much the same spirit an eager student of prophecy once exclaimed that the Song of Solomon must undoubtedly be a genuine portion of the Canon, "*because*" said he "*it is necessary to my scheme of interpretation !*"

Now, that some feelings of this kind were at work in the mind of Dr. Arnold, sufficiently appears from the significant

⁸ Ant. x. c. 12. § 7.

language in which we find him referring to his "Sermons on Prophecy":—

"The points in particular on which I did not wish to enter, if I could help it, but which very likely I shall be forced to touch on, relate to the latter chapters of Daniel, which, if genuine, would be a clear *exception to my canon of interpretation*, as there can be no reasonable spiritual meaning made out of the Kings of the North and South."

So far, then, as Dr. Arnold is concerned, it seems to have been prejudice rather than reason which induced him to express himself as he has done with respect to the book of Daniel. And it should be extensively known that his views on this point were held in connection with—even if not on account of—his peculiar conceptions of the meaning of prophecy, and cannot therefore be regarded as his deliberate and unbiassed convictions, arrived at on the principles of historical criticism.

As has been said, however, there are unquestionably not a few grounds on which the authenticity of the book of Daniel may very plausibly be assailed. These, urged with much ingenuity by some German critics, have been powerfully and conclusively met by others. Indeed, nothing could be more triumphant or satisfactory than the manner in which such writers as "Hävernick" and Hengstenberg meet and refute the objections of their learned countrymen to the canonical authority of Daniel; and although, within our contracted limits it is impossible to exhibit fully the triumphant character of these replies, still, in this case as in others, an outline may be of service.

The principal objections, then, which criticism, ancient and modern, has urged against the reception of the book of Daniel into the canon, are the following:—

- I. The place which it holds in the Old Testament, among the Hagiographa, and not the prophetical books.
- II. The silence of Jesus the son of Sirach, respecting Daniel

⁹ Especially in his "New Critical Investigations respecting the Book of Daniel."

when, in the book of Ecclesiasticus, recounting the famous men of his nation.

III. The frequency with which, throughout the book, Daniel's own name is introduced in terms of laudation.

IV. The occurrence of Greek words in it, and the generally mean and corrupt style in which it is written.

V. The historical contradictions which it is alleged to contain.

VI. The marvellous occurrences which it sets forth as facts.

VII. The nature of the pretended prophecies which it records.

VIII. The doctrinal and ethical views which it presents.

On all these grounds it is affirmed that the book of Daniel could not have been composed at the date usually attributed to it, viz. about 500 years B.C. ; but must have been written in the time of the Maccabees, about three hundred and fifty years later.

Let us now see what the affirmation is worth.

I. The answer to this objection is easy.

1. There is an important distinction to be observed between Daniel on the one hand, and Isaiah, Ezekiel, &c., on the other. Though like them, he possessed the *gift* of prophecy, yet unlike them, he was not invested with the *office* of a prophet ; and on this account his work might properly and advisedly have been assigned to the third division of the sacred writings, rather than to the strictly prophetical portion. Moreover,

2. This objection proves nothing as to *date*. The allocation of books of the Old Testament depends on dogmatic, and not on chronological reasons. The Psalms, for instance, are found in the third division of the collected writings, although some of them are admitted to be as ancient as the days of Moses. Besides,

3. Had this book been composed as alleged, in the Maccabean period, it would not have been in the canon at all. Everything that is known on the subject goes to prove that the contents of the entire canon were definitively settled and fixed long before that period commenced. And in saying this we do not rely merely on the tradition—a tradition universal and undoubted among the Jews themselves—that the Canon was finally arranged by Ezra ; although that tradition has never

been disproved, and Ezra himself was one of Daniel's contemporaries.

4. It follows therefore, that in order to account for this book of Daniel being found in the Hebrew Bible at all, we must dismiss the idea of its origin in the Maccabean period.

II. This—at first sight—does certainly appear to be an objection of some weight. We might naturally have expected that in such a catalogue of Hebrew worthies as that presented by the son of Sirach (in Eccles. xlix.), the illustrious seer and statesman of the Exile, should have held a prominent place. But after all, this omission proves nothing against the genuineness of the *book* which bears his name. For

1. If the silence of the writer of Ecclesiasticus proved anything, it would be that no such famous *person* as Daniel was known in the annals of his nation. But

2. Ezekiel settles that. And it should be remembered that the book of Ezekiel does form part of the canon of authoritative Scripture, while the book of Ecclesiasticus does not, and never did. Ezekiel's remarkable words (Ez. xiv. 14, 20) afford indubitable evidence that even then Daniel was held in high repute, and was well known as an Israelite of whom his nation might justly be proud.

3. There are many ways of accounting for this silence; but we are not concerned with them. It is sufficient to rebut the objection to show, as we have done from Ezekiel, that whatever else the cause may have been, it was not that which the objector assumes: it was not because Daniel was then unknown to fame. We may suggest a probable reason, however, and one which naturally suggests itself on a perusal of the passage in question. The writer was hurrying on to the men of his own time. And in harmony with this purpose of brevity there are several other significant omissions. He names Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel as representatives of the prophets; but

4. None of the minor prophets are particularly noticed. And the omission of Ezra—notwithstanding the very illustrious place which he held in the Jewish annals, and the distinguished veneration with which he is to this day regarded by the Jewish people—an omission the more remarkable as his

friend and associate Nehemiah is expressly mentioned—is a fact not less strange than the omission of Daniel himself.

5. In a word: as the insertion of Daniel's name would only have proved, what is otherwise certain, viz. that there did exist an illustrious person known by that name: so, its omission proves nothing respecting the *book* which claims his authorship.

III. This objection is not true in point of fact. It is to God that the glory is continually ascribed. Even in those passages in which the writer himself is spoken of in terms of laudation and honor, the very opposite of an arrogant self-sufficiency appears.

IV. The objection is twofold:

a. Certain *Greek* words occur in it; and these (it is alleged) indicate its late origin. Bertholdt reckoned up *ten* such words; but by more recent critics *six* of these have been abandoned. The only terms now brought forward as being undoubtedly coincident with the Greek, are the four names of musical instruments¹⁰ which occur at ch. iii. 5, 7, 10, and are there translated "harp," "sackbut," "psaltery," and "dulcimer." The argument against the book derived from these words, rests upon the assumption that no Greek terms found their way into the East previous to the conquests of Alexander the Great. But

1. Facts do not justify such an opinion. On the contrary, we have plain proof that long before the Macedonian invasion, there existed, to some extent, an interchange of ideas and expressions between the Eastern and Western nations.¹¹

2. It has been admitted accordingly by several of our opponents, that no stress can be laid on the circumstance now under consideration. De Wette himself acknowledges that "it is certainly quite possible that Greek instruments and their names may have been known to the Babylonians;" and Rosenmüller is of the same opinion.

¹⁰ בְּקִירָתָם, κιθαρίς; סְבִבָּא, σαμβύκη; פְּכִינְתָּרָךְ, ψαλτήρις; and סְמִמְפִינָּה, συμφωνία.

¹¹ Thus, such Shemitic words

as κάδος, a cask, (Heb. קָדָה), and λιβανωτός, frankincense, (Heb. לִבְנָה?), are found in Herodotus; and it is undeniable that at a very early period there was traffic between Western Asia and Greece.

b. The “mean and corrupt style” is objected to. This objection, like vaulting ambition

“——— o'erleaps its sell
And falls on t'other side.”

Nothing could be more congruent to the circumstances in which the book professes to have been written, than its language and style. Like its cotemporary work, the book of Ezra, it is partly in Hebrew and partly in Chaldee; and the Hebrew, as in the later books of the Old Testament, is of an impure and corrupted character. Could anything be more natural, in a book written by one who received his education at the court of Babylon, and who spent his whole life where the Chaldean language was the vernacular? In such a case, the presence of pure Hebrew classicality would have been the true wonder. And thus in fact, the pretended objection derived from the comparatively mixed and vitiated character of its language, is rather in favor of the genuineness of the book than against it.

V. There are four contradictions of some importance alleged under this head. Two of them have been already disposed of, when treating of Scripture Difficulties (pp. 75, 76); the third and fourth remain to be considered. The third is this:—Darius the Mede (Cyaxares II.), is a fictitious personage, who never had a real existence. For this sweeping assertion the only assignable reason is the silence of Herodotus respecting him. But

1. It is a well-known practice of that historian, to pass by such kings as were not remarkably distinguished. And

2. Xenophon, in the Cyropœdia, expressly mentions this Cyaxares II.—a testimony in favor of Daniel’s accuracy which cannot be set aside by any consideration as to the unhistorical character of Xenophon’s work: for that work deals throughout with *real persons*, and is, so far, to be considered as of historical value. Besides this, we find that

3. Æschylus in the Persæ¹² confirms the truth both of Daniel’s and Xenophon’s statement with respect to this Cyaxares or Darius.

It is alleged (fourthly) that the accounts given in the book of

¹² Persæ 762-5.

Daniel respecting the Magi and Satrapæ of Babylon are incorrect. But the *allegation is utterly groundless*. Recent explorations of the ruins of Babylon, by Layard and others, have tended strongly to illustrate the accuracy of the book of Daniel, and to manifest the superiority of its *historical* trustworthiness and importance, as compared with the accounts contained in other ancient writings. Thus, Herodotus makes no mention whatever of Nebuchadnezzar, and attributes the magnificence of Babylon to the efforts of others. But the inscribed bricks, scattered in such numbers throughout the plain of Babylonia, and so many of which have now been deciphered, authenticate the statements of the sacred writer; the inscription which continually occurs upon them testifying to the grandeur of the monarch celebrated in this book—"Nebuchadnezzar, son of Nabopolassar."

VI. The objections under this head may be classed as general and special.

a. The first are urged by those who set themselves against *all* miracles; and their reasoning, if admitted, would set aside the whole of Revelation which rests on miracles, as well as this book of Daniel. But as this question of miracles will be noticed in its proper place, we need not dwell upon it here.

b. Special exception however has been taken to the despotism which commanded the execution of the magicians and wise men, as well as to the edict forbidding prayer except to Darius himself. But it is now agreed among competent authorities not only that these things are in harmony with the absolutism of Eastern sovereigns, but that they might even be paralleled by what takes place in those countries at the present day. The account of Nebuchadnezzar's singular hypocondriacism, often as it has been objected to, is expressly confirmed by Berosus, and incidentally by Abydenus also.

VII. This objection also is twofold. It is said (*a*) that up to a certain period the Danielic prophecies are so full and distinct, as to prove them really historic records; and (*b*) that after the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, they become so obscure as to make it evident that the writer lived about that epoch, and could not carry his pretended predictions further. We reply

a. The charge is untrue. Daniel's prophecies have indeed a striking definiteness, but they cannot be tortured into a mere record of political events. Ezekiel's prophecies have a similar definiteness; so much so that De Wette declares that in this respect, he surpasses all the ancient prophets. In both cases the predictions never lose their intimate connexion with that great idea which is the fundamental characteristic of all Scripture prophecy.

b. The second part of the charge is as untenable as the first. Those who make it (Eichhorn, Ewald, and others) are utterly unable to give any explanation of chapter vii. which shall be consistent with the facts of the case. Besides the Babylonian, the Medo-Persian, the Macedonian, and the Roman Empires, no others can be found to fit in with the imagery which Daniel employs; whereas these do so with great exactness. These predictions therefore do extend beyond the Maccabean period, since they embrace the Roman Empire; and the establishment of this point alone entirely repels the objection under consideration.

VIII. It is thought that (a) the great importance attributed to prayer—(b) the frequent fastings—and (c) the Angelology of the book, indicate a later period of the Jewish history than the one we assign as the true date. Valid grounds of objection must indeed be scarce when critics can invent or assign such grounds as these. For

a. The Psalms everywhere refute this objection. If Daniel the prime-minister prayed three times a-day, he did no more than David the King had done five hundred years before him.¹³

b. Such fasting was common in the Exile, and so was the abstinence from special kinds of food.¹⁴ And

c. The Angelology is quite consistent with what is contained in the books of Ezekiel and Zechariah.¹⁵

We have been thus particular both in detailing the objections and repelling them, in the hope that thereby it might the more plainly appear how little of solidity and substance is possessed even by the most specious and plausible objections which "the

¹³ Ps. lv. 18. ¹⁴ Ez. viii. 21; Ze. vii. 3 et seq.: Eze. xxii. 26.

¹⁵ Eze. ix. 10.; Ze. i.—vi.

higher criticism" can furnish. But in addition to all that has been said, there is a mass of positive evidence in favor of the canonicity of Daniel, which cannot be gainsaid. By repelling the negative evidence, we win the disputed position: by adducing the positive evidence, we fortify it. We may take leave of the subject then, by specifying a few particulars of this sort.

And as a preliminary remark, it should be noticed that the book is *one*: whatever proves the genuineness of a part proves the genuineness of the whole; so closely, so organically are its historical and prophetic parts connected with each other. The peculiarities of phraseology are in both the same: a consideration well worth the attention of those who, like Arnold, while doubting as to some portions, frankly admit the genuineness of the rest. But note now especially, that,

I. *The book could never have been acknowledged as part of the Inspired Scriptures, except on the ground of its genuineness.* We have already referred to the fact that the Canon was definitively closed, long before the Maccabean period; but even had it been otherwise, it would still be impossible, on the sceptical theory, to account for the admission of Daniel. It has been said indeed that it was accepted because it recommended itself to the existing national spirit. But the fact is

1. That it does exactly the reverse. The prediction respecting the suffering Messiah (in ch. ix.) for instance, is one which directly opposes the national spirit. But besides this, if even it had been perfectly conformed to the national taste, such conformity would entirely fail to account for its elevation to a place in Holy Scripture. For it is notorious that

2. The Apocryphal books, which appeared in that age, did exactly reflect the character and feelings of the nation; yet they were never admitted to the sacred honor of a place in the canon.

II. *The genuineness of the book is attested by the manner in which Ezekiel refers to Daniel.*¹⁶ For, from the place assigned to Daniel's name, it might naturally be thought that Ezekiel represented him, like Noah and Job, as living long before his

¹⁶ Ez. xiv. 14. 20.

own time. A forger therefore, in the Maccabean age, would never have thought of putting Daniel in the time of the Exile; for by so doing he would have *seemed* to contradict Ezekiel and thus would have inserted a hindrance to the reception of his own work. Whereas, on the supposition that the work is what it professes to be, there is no difficulty whatever. From the book of Daniel itself,¹⁷ it is plain that Daniel had gained a wide celebrity in the land of Chaldea; and with this fact, the way in which Ezekiel refers to him exactly corresponds when he says ironically respecting the prince of Tyre, “Behold, thou art wiser than Daniel; there is no secret thing that they can hide from thee.”¹⁸

III. *The Septuagint translation strongly attests its genuineness.* For in that translation, this book, like the book of Jeremiah, is not so much translated, as recast. A number of fables and legendary stories are introduced; showing how much interest was felt in this book by the Alexandrine translator, and arguing conclusively that it must have been known long before the time of the Maccabees.

IV. *Its genuineness is confirmed by the account given by Josephus¹⁹ of the visit of Alexander the Great to Jerusalem.²⁰* Whether it be historically true or not, that Jaddua showed to Alexander the prophecy of Daniel which declared that Persia should be subjugated by a Grecian monarch, it is evident that Josephus and his contemporaries generally, *believed* that the book of Daniel existed previous even to the times of Alexander. But this belief is unaccountable (if not impossible) on the supposition of a forgery. Melanthon, in his commentary on Daniel, thus connects the times of that prophet with Christ. “Nehemiah, who in his youth had seen Daniel, then advanced in years, in his old age saw Alexander. After the time of Antiochus many old men were slain; yet God preserved a certain posterity. *Simeon, who carried the infant Christ in his bosom, saw, when a young man, old men who had seen the Maccabees.*” Such being the close connection of the periods, it is incredible that the book of Daniel would have been received as the genuine product of the age to which it professes

¹⁷ ch. ii.

¹⁸ ch. xxviii. v. 3.

¹⁹ Antiq. xi. 8.

²⁰ B.C. 332.

to belong, had it not been the authentic production of the prophet whose name it bears.

V. *Its genuineness is attested by internal evidence.*

1. The relation set forth in the book, as existing between heathens and Jews, is one that could not have been conceived in the Maccabean period. To have been educated in the language and science of Babylon—to have been constituted chief of the wise men at the Chaldean court—to have received a heathen name—to have stood in the most friendly connection with heathen princes—are all things totally alien from the spirit of vigorous fanaticism which characterised the Jews of Palestine in the time of the Maccabees.

2. The accurate knowledge which the writer shews of the manners and customs of ancient Babylon and Media, and which even writers like De Wette acknowledge—his use of the expression *Medes and Persians* instead of *Persians and Medes*, (as in the late book of Esther, and in the first book of Maccabees,) indicating that in his days the Medes were still the superior people—the evident reference to his prophecies in several of the Apocryphal books, (such as Baruch and 1 Maccabees) proving the prior existence of those prophecies—the foreign air about the book, agreeable to its own profession of having been written in Chaldea, rather than in Palestine, as the opponents of its genuineness maintain; these and many similar considerations conspire to demonstrate the authenticity of the book, and to render perfectly untenable the hypothesis of its Maccabean origin.

VI. But the great proof yet remains to be stated. Besides the general fact that this book of Daniel is contained in those “Scriptures” which so often received the sanction of our Lord and His apostles, it is, in several passages, specially quoted as inspired. We need only refer to Ma. xxiv. 15, in order to see the estimation in which this book was held by Him, who being Himself “The Truth,” never, in any manner or degree, gave His sanction to what was false. In that place, He interweaves the predictions of Daniel with His own; placing them on the same footing of certainty, acknowledging their infallible accuracy, and expressly styling their author “Daniel the prophet.” To all who reverence the authority of Christ, this testimony is

decisive. To add to this would be impossible. And so we take leave of this pretentious Criticism in the words which Daniel addressed to the proud Belshazzar himself—"Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting."²¹

Before quitting the subject of the Old Testament canon, it may be necessary to substantiate the assertion already made, that the Apocrypha is no part of Inspired Scripture. Many persons appear to have an idea that the distinction between the canonical and apocryphal writings is altogether arbitrary. To dispel this idea, and shew clearly the impassable barrier of demarcation between the two, it will be sufficient to state briefly the principal points of the **EVIDENCE AGAINST THE CANONICITY OF THE APOCRYPHA.**

I. Externally, the evidence is conclusive.

1. The apocryphal books are not found in any catalogue of canonical writings, made during the first four centuries after Christ.

2. They were never regarded as part of the Rule of Faith, until the Romanists at the last Council of Trent presumed to call them so.²²

3. Philo never quotes them as he does the Sacred Scriptures; and Josephus (in the passage against Apion i. 8, already quoted) expressly excludes them.

4. The Jewish Church never received them as part of the Canon. Not one of them is extant in Hebrew; while the Canonical Books are all so. Nay, one of them, the fourth book of Esdras, is extant only in Latin.

5. They are never quoted either by our Lord or by His Apostles; a fact the more striking, as St. Paul thrice quotes heathen poets.²³

²¹ From a Paper, partly on this subject, in the British and Foreign Ev. Review, vol. viii. p. 713. many of these points have been freely condensed.

²² At its last session, held in 1550. Was it from respect to Augustine and Jerome? or was it from a wish to have some quasi-

scriptural authority for its own crimes and misdemeanours, that Pope Pius IV. and his creatures dared to anathematize all who refused "to believe a lie" at their bidding?

²³ The apophthegm in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, ch. xv. v. 33,

6. It is remarkable too, that the last inspired prophet²⁴ closes his predictions, by recommending to his countrymen the books of Moses, and intimates that no other message is to be expected by them till the coming of the second Elijah.

II. The internal evidence confirms this conclusion.

1. Divine authority is claimed by none of the writers; and by some it is virtually disclaimed. By the writer of the Prologue to the Book of Ecclesiasticus for instance, who in the name of his grandfather (the principal compiler of the book) as well as in his own, asks the reader's pardon for the writers' apparent imperfections; and who, although referring to the recognized threefold division of the Scriptures, gives not the least hint that the book he was publishing was to be included amongst them. So, too, the writer of 2 Maccabees sets out with this declaration of his intention:—"We will essay to abridge in one volume" the "five books" of "Jason of Cyrene."²⁵ His conclusion is as follows:—"And here will I make an end. And if [I have done] well, and as is fitting the story, it is that which I desired: but if slenderly and meanly, it is that which I could attain unto."²⁶ Contrast this with the

Φθείρουσιν ἡθὸν χειροθέτοις ὄμηλίαις κακοῖς,
is an iambic from the *Thais* of Menander. [Socrates (Hist. Eccl. iii. 16.) quotes it as proving that St. Paul read Euripides. Perhaps Menander took it from Euripides.] The character of the Cretans, Tit. i. 12,

Κρητεῖς ἀεὶ ψιῦσται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστρίες
αργαῖ,

is an hexameter from Epimenides. The third quotation occurs in the address to the Athenians, Ac. xvii. 28;

Τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γίνος ἴστρεν:

and is taken from the *Phænomena* of Aratus, a Cilician poet, a native of Tarsus or its neighbourhood, and thus a fellow-countryman of the apostle. He flourished B.C. 270, under the patronage of

Ptolemy Philadelphus. In making this quotation the apostle speaks of "poets." He may have had in view more than one; for it is worthy of note that with the alteration of a letter, the same sentence is to be found in the magnificent hymn of Cleanthes to Jupiter (B.C. 300): "ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ γίνος ἐσμέν."

²⁴ Mal. iv. 4. 6. "Moses legislator primus divina responsa nobis perscripta reliquit. Divus vero Malachias post omnes qui prophetiam scripserunt divina oracula scriptis mandavit." (Theodor. in Malach. vol. ii.)

²⁵ 2 Mac. ii. 23.

²⁶ As I have no wish to make this writer seem absurd, I have forborne to quote his preference for wine-and-water.

“Thus saith the Lord !” of the Old Testament, or with the “Certainty” of the “words which the Holy Ghost teacheth,” as found in the New.

2. The book contains statements at variance with history,²⁷ self-contradictory,²⁸ and opposed to the doctrines²⁹ and precepts of Scripture.³⁰

And yet, in their proper place, for historical purposes, and for “instruction of manners,” so far as they exemplify the spirit and precepts of the Gospel, these books are not without considerable value. Some of them explain ancient prophecies, and prove their fulfilment; others exhibit the most exalted sentiments and principles of uninspired men; while all illustrate the progress of knowledge among the Jews, their taste, their religious character, and their government.

But they are without authority, and form no part of the rule of faith.³¹ As for including them in the Canon of Inspired Scripture, we might as well include the book of Enoch;³² or, even, with Dr. Donaldson’s permission, the book of Jashar.

²⁷ Baruch i. 2, compared with Jer. xliii. 6, 7. The story of Bel and the Dragon contradicts the account of Daniel being cast into the lion’s den.

²⁸ Cf. 1 Mac. vi. 4. 16; 2 Mac. i. 13. 16: 2 Mac. ix. 28, as to the place where Antiochus Epiphanes died. The writer of the Book of Wisdom pretends that it was composed by Solomon: yet he quotes Is. xiii. 11. 18.

²⁹ Prayers for the dead: 2 Mac. xii. 43. 45. Justification by works: Tob. xii. 8. 9.; 2 Esd. viii. 33.

³⁰ Sanction is given to Lying, Tob. v. xii. 12. 15.; Suicide, 2 Mac. xiv. 42.; Assassination, Judith, ix. 2. 9. (cf. Gen. xlix. 7.) Magical incantations, Tob. vi. 16. 17.

³¹ “I dare challenge any one whatsoever to shew me any place

in either of the Talmuds, in any of the Targums, or indeed in any of the Jewish writers, where they make mention of any of these books. If they had been any part of the Old Testament, why was there not also a masora made upon them as well as upon the other books? . . . Neither were the Jews only unacquainted with the books so long ago, but to this day ask any of them, and they will tell you there is nothing of Scripture, nothing in the word of God, nothing of Divine authority, but what is ordinarily read in their synagogues, which I am sure these books never yet were.” (Bishop Beveridge on the VIth Article.)

³² This work, in its entire state, has come down to us only in an Ethiopic translation, copies of which were brought over to this

The canonicity of the New Testament writings admits of being treated with greater brevity. It may be sufficient to observe generally, that the four Gospels, the first thirteen Epistles of St. Paul, the first Epistle of St. Peter, and the first Epistle of St. John, were always acknowledged to be written by the persons whose names they bear,³³ and the Acts of the Apostles by St. Luke: concerning the genuineness of the other seven books, namely, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of St. James, the second Epistle of St. Peter, the second and third Epistles of St. John, the Epistle of St. Jude, and the Revelation, there was for some time considerable hesitation. But it is important to observe that this circumstance of temporary doubt, instead of invalidating the authority of these books, gives a sanction to the whole collection, by proving the caution with which any book was admitted into the sacred Canon.

For it is not as if the church had ever *denied* the genuineness of these books: it is only that at a very early period—when sufficient evidence had not been received in all places, that they were really apostolical writings—*doubts* were entertained as to their right to be admitted into the Canon. It appears that they did not come into general circulation so soon as the Gospels and other Epistles; and there might be some difficulty in obtaining testimony concerning them at places remote from the countries where they were first published; but as soon as there was time and opportunity for making the necessary inquiries, and for ascertaining the authors of these books, their genuineness was universally allowed. Indeed, such means had the early Christians of knowing the truth, and so

country by the traveller Bruce. Archbishop Laurence published a translation of it into English, in 1833. It is chiefly remarkable as containing the passage quoted by Jude. But its spurious character is evident; no one who reads it can doubt that it is neither a genuine nor an authentic production.

³³ As these terms (genuine and authentic) are used by some

writers almost indiscriminately—Paley himself even having not always used them in the same sense—and by others with meanings diametrically opposed; it may be necessary to remark that they are here employed uniformly in accordance with what has unquestionably been the received usage since Paley's time, although to that usage there have been two or three strange exceptions. "Any

scrupulously discriminating was the care and judgment which they exercised in settling the Canon of the New Testament, that no writing which was pronounced by them genuine, has been found to be spurious, nor has any been found to be genuine which they rejected.³⁴ Celsus, Porphyry, Julian, and all the other early adversaries of Christianity, admitted that the books of the New Testament were written by the persons whose names they bear; and that circumstance alone is a sufficient proof of their genuineness.

Nor is it unimportant to observe the testimony of the swarms of sectaries and heretics which infested the early Church. Arians and Millenarians, Sabellians and Carpocratians, Pelagians and Valentinians, Priscillianists and Donatists, though agreed in nothing else, were all agreed in their profession of veneration for the Scriptures.

With respect to those writings which for a time were questioned, it must be borne in mind that the only point on

writing or book is called *genuine*, when it has been written by the person whose name it bears as the author; *authentic* when it relates matters of fact as they really happened." (Bp. Watson: *Apology for the Bible*.) "So that a book or writing is *genuine*, when it is not a *forgery*, and *authentic* when its contents are not *fiction*. Hence a writing may be *genuine*, yet not *authentic*, or *authentic*, though the word *genuine* cannot be applied to it. *Canonical* writings are those which are of divine authority, and imply that they are the writings which *regulate* the faith and practice of Christians. An *Apocryphal* writing is one whose origin is hidden, and whose divine authority is doubted or disallowed. A *spurious* writing is one put clandestinely into the place of another. By the *integrity* of a writing, is meant its freedom from mutila-

tions and interpolations, and its agreement with the original manuscript of the author." (Potts.)

³⁴ Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea (died A.D. 340), divided all the writings which laid any claim to be considered as authoritative in the Church into three classes:—1. Those universally acknowledged; 2. Those objected to; and 3. The heretical. The last he wholly rejects. And it well deserves our consideration that subsequent ages have only served to confirm his judgment on the whole subject. Out of the class of those "objected to," all that Eusebius mentions favorably have been received: and all that he considers spurious have been rejected. There could be no more striking proof of the care and the skill exercised by the early church in their determination of the canon.

which the question turned, was that of genuineness. The canonicity of the writings of James, Cephas, John and Jude was undoubted and undisputed. The sole point which was doubted was whether the writings bearing their names were really written by them. Nor can these doubts excite surprise. The subject was one of deep interest. Many spurious compositions were abroad under the names of these very Apostles. Apostolic teaching might be quoted in defence of caution.³⁵ The internal evidence of these Epistles is peculiar. The Epistle to the Hebrews, for example, is without the author's name, and differs in style from most of the Pauline Epistles. The style of 2 Peter differs in the same way from the style of the first Epistle. In James and Jude the authors are described not as apostles, but as "servants" of Christ; while in 2 and 3 John, the writer describes himself (not as an apostle, but) as a presbyter or elder. All these causes of doubt did operate, as we know. In the end there was universal conviction; and the very doubts which deferred the reception of a small portion of Scripture in certain parts of the early Church, now serve to confirm our faith in the rest.

By way of illustration, let us take the Epistle to the Hebrews.

I. That St. Paul was the author was the prevalent belief of the ancients.

1. Those to whom the Epistle was sent, must have known the writer,³⁶ and in preserving and circulating it could hardly fail to communicate their knowledge. Now the *early* fathers of the Eastern and Alexandrian churches in the second and third centuries, tell us that the "ancients" (who if not the very persons who received the original must at least have been their contemporaries) had handed it down to them as a writing of Paul's. And the most learned among them, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Eusebius, (although sensible of whatever doubt or difficulty existed) regarded this testimony as conclusive.

2. This is corroborated by the author's intimate acquaintance with the Jewish system—so worthy of the disciple of Gamaliel; and his sympathizing interest in the salvation of the Jewish

³⁵ 2 Th. ii. 1, 2; 1 Jno. iv. 1.

³⁶ See ch. x. 34; xiii. 18, 19, 23.

people, so like that which is found in Paul's acknowledged writings.³⁷

3. The few personal allusions found in the Epistle are all perfectly compatible with what we know of the history of St. Paul.³⁸

4. And so far is it from presenting such peculiarities of style as would warrant the supposition of another authorship, that (as will presently be shown) its peculiarities afford the most conclusive testimony to its Pauline origin.

II. Why then did he not prefix his name?³⁹

1. Because he prefixes no inscription, in which, if at all, the name would have been mentioned. The ardour of his spirit carries him directly upon his subject, (just like St. John in his first Epistle,) and throws back his usual salutation and thanksgiving to the conclusion.

2. Jerome says, Paul considered himself peculiarly the apostle of the Gentiles, and therefore did not wish to obtrude on the Hebrew Christians the authority of his name.

3. Others think that the omission was designed to secure a hearing for his arguments undisturbed by their prejudices. But not least forcible is the language of Beza: he says

4. "If it is not to be considered as Paul's, because it does not bear his name; let it belong to no one, because it bears no name. But on the contrary, I contend from this very circumstance, that it belongs to Paul rather than to any other person. For why should any other person have omitted his name? But Paul had a sufficient reason for sending an anonymous letter to Jerusalem . . . because he knew his name was greatly hated at Jerusalem by the enemies of Christianity, and that their fury was even then raging; and was perhaps exasperated by occasion of his imprisonment: (x. 33, 34:) he was therefore unwilling to inflame them against the church by affixing his name."

³⁷ Ro. ix. 10, 11; Ph. iii.

³⁸ E. g. The mention of the author's bonds in Italy; and of Timothy as his companion. Thus (on xiii. 23) Grotius says, Timothy, "qui cum Paulo Romæ fuerat, datusque in vinecula, ac deinde liberatus."

³⁹ The superscription "The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews" (though added by some later hand) is found in all our Manuscripts except one; the superscription of that one being "The Epistle to the Hebrews."

III. One objection there is which seemed so strong to Luther and Calvin (although denounced by others as “frivolous”) as to be decisive against the Pauline origin. Chap. ii. 3, seems to contradict Ga. i. 11, 12. But

1. It is merely the employment of a common figure of speech ; and the writer is in strictness no more to be included in the number of those whom he addresses, than is St. Peter when, speaking in the same manner, he identifies himself with the vilest reprobates.⁴⁰

2. If St. Paul thought it prudent that this Epistle should appear as if written not by an apostle, but by some ordinary converted Jew, he must of course appear to join himself with the other Jewish converts, and not distinguish himself from them, as having received his doctrine immediately from Christ.

IV. As Hebrew or Syriac was the vernacular tongue of those to whom this epistle was addressed, Origen, Jerome, and others supposed that it had been originally written in Hebrew, and afterwards translated by Luke, Barnabas, or Clement. But the supposition is entirely groundless. For

1. No one ever professed to have seen such an Epistle ; nor is there even any authentic tradition concerning it. And the internal evidence presented by the Greek text is conclusive against the supposition of its being merely a translation. For

2. The style throughout has all the air of an original.

3. There are numerous paronomasias on Greek words, which of course would have been impossible had the original not been in Greek.⁴¹

4. The word (*διαθήκη*) covenant, or testament, is used in a way in which it could not have been, if originally in Hebrew.

5. It does not contain Hebraisms, as does the LXX.

6. Hebrew names are interpreted in it, (e.g. Melchisedek, Salem,) and the argument is sometimes founded on the interpretation of the words. And

⁴⁰ 1 Pet. iv. 3.

⁴¹ E. g. ch. x. v. 39, where the *ὑποστολῆς* refers to the *ὑποστείληται* of the preceding verse. In verse 37 too the words *ἴτι μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον*

are not in Habakkuk : But the phrase *ὅσον ὅσον* is in Aristophanes Vesp. 213. Observe too such alliterative proverbial expressions as *ἴμαθεν—ἴπαθε*, ch. 5. v. 8.

7. The quotations from the Old Testament are generally taken from the Septuagint, even where that version somewhat differs from the Hebrew.

V. It appears that St. Peter referred to this Epistle, for he says that Paul had written to the same persons as those to whom he was writing; i.e. the believing Jews in general (2 Pe. i. 1), and those of the dispersion (1 Pe. i. 1). He says also that Paul had discussed the same topics as he himself had; and this is remarkably the case in the Epistle to the Hebrews.⁴² There is a correspondence too, in Peter's description of Paul's writings as (*δυστονόητα*) "hard to be understood" with Paul's own language (*δυσερμήνευτα*) "hard to be uttered."⁴³ But the crowning proof, after all, of the Pauline authorship of this epistle is found in

VI. A minute examination of its style. This has been effected so ably in the elaborate work of the Rev. Charles Forster as to set further controversy completely at rest. In an analysis of the entire Epistle, St Paul's authorship is established

1. From the identity of manner in the use of particular words between this Epistle and the undisputed ones:

2. In the use of the word (*καταργεῖν*) to disannul.

3. By Tables of New Testament words peculiar to this Epistle and the others of St. Paul.

4. By Tables of words found nowhere else in the New Testament, except in the other Epistles of St. Paul.

5. By Tables of words occasionally occurring in the New Testament, but peculiar in manner, or frequency of occurrence, to this Epistle and the undisputed ones.

6. By examination of leading parallel passages from this Epistle and the undisputed ones.

7. By identity of manner in the use of favorite words.

8. By identity of manner in going off at a word.⁴⁴

9. By identity of manner in the use of the figure paronomasia, or the play on a word.

⁴² Cf. 2 Pe. ii. 20, 21, with Heb. vi. 4—9. Again: 2 Pet. i. 5—16; and ii. 15; with Heb. ii. 1—5; and iii. 6—19.

⁴³ 2 Pe. iii. 16; He. v. 11.

⁴⁴ This may seem to require explanation. Let us take an example from one of the undisputed epistles, and then compare it with the usage of the epistle before us. In the

10. By identity of manner in quotations, and in the mode of quotations from the Old Testament.

11. By identity of manner in the use of key-texts.

12. By harmony of parallel passages between this and the undisputed Epistles.

So that reviewing the whole mass of proofs, we may fairly say

“Awake but one, and lo! what myriads rise!”

Nor is even the uncritical reader quite precluded from perceiving some proof of this kind: something of St. Paul's method is so easy to be observed. He places, as usual, the proposition and division, before the treatise (ii. 17); he subjoins the hortatory

3rd chapter of the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, St. Paul is abating the value set on the rival teachers, by referring all the good they did, whatever it was, to God. “I have planted,” says he, “Apollos watered, but God gave the increase. So then neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth, but the increasing God—ἀλλ' ὁ αὐξάνως Θεός—the weighty word closing the sentence in the Greek. And accordingly St. Paul goes off at this word in a parenthesis from v. 8 down to v. 21. And it is observable that although in the English Version, the word man is introduced no fewer than eleven times in these thirteen verses, it is so without any authority for it in the Greek; which, literally translated, would read “every (one),” “any (one),” “no (one),” instead of “every man,” “any man,” “no man.” But while man is thus kept in the background, the foreground is filled with God. Look where you will, you see God. “We are labourers together with God;” “ye are the husbandry of God;” “ye are the temple of God;” and thus

he goes on through the whole of this digression or parenthesis, (for such it is,) magnifying God, and shewing that “the help which is done upon earth, the Lord doeth it,” until in v. 21. he returns to his purpose, saying, “Therefore let no one glory in *men*:” where for the first time the word (*ἀνθρώπος*) occurs in the Greek. And the end of the parenthesis is shewn by the emphasis thrown on this word “men” (*ἀνθρώποις*), as contrasting with “God” (*Θεός*), the word from which he has started, and the word which he had been repeating again and again all the parenthesis through, giving it all accumulation of weight, by placing it constantly in the prominent position of the sentence where it appears, and by still using the word itself, and no substitute for it, or pronoun: meanwhile sinking the word “man,” till this parenthesis, full of the Godhead, should be complete, and he could overwhelm “man” and man's pretensions, as exhibited in the persons of these rival teachers, when he at length reaches their case in v. 21. “There-

to the doctrinal part; he quotes the same scriptures and uses the same expressions as elsewhere. If this Epistle differs from his others in the rhetorical length of words and finish of sentences, it is only the more like his speeches recorded by Luke. So regular a composition would naturally vary in manner from letters of a different character, written under different circumstances. Yet the careful reader will not fail to find the same conciseness of expression, the same abruptness of transition, the same habit of mind appearing in reasonings addressed to the latent thoughts and objections of the readers, as well as in the occasional involutions and long parentheses resulting from that kindling of soul and exuberance of feeling, which characterize the Apostle's other writings.

fore let no one glory in *men*," for all are yours, since you are Christ's and Christ is God's. (See Prof. Blunt's "Parish Priest," p. 73.)

Now in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the whole of the sixth chapter is a parenthesis of this sort. The "food of babes," touched on at the close of the fifth chapter, leads the writer to enlarge on those elementary truths, those "first principles of the doctrine of Christ" with which the sixth chapter is occupied; and it is only in chapter seven that he proceeds to the higher doctrines which those only who were further advanced in knowledge could understand properly—the "strong meat" which the mature, the perfect—the *τέλειοι*—and they only were able to digest. So that the whole of the sixth chapter and the last four verses of the fifth, are a digression on "the first principles of the oracles of God;" and it is only in the 1st verse of the seventh chapter that the apostle resumes his former topic, "things hard to be uttered," i. e.

the exposition of the mystical character of Melchisedec. Thus it will be seen that omitting the parenthesis, the argument is carried on uninterruptedly, concerning Jesus, "a High Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec." The sentence which precedes the parenthesis and the sentence with which it is closed are alike; and the digression it contains is occasioned solely by a wish to meet the ease of those readers whose ignorant obtuseness had made the height of the great argument "hard to be uttered" (For other instances, similar though smaller, see Paley's Horæ Paulinæ, ch. vi. § 8.)

This note is already too long, Yet I cannot close it without noticing the use which it exhibits of one of the Apostle's favorite terms—the opposition of *νήπιοι* to *τέλειοι* (He. v. 13, 14). Compare the same usage in 1 Co. xiii. 10, 11; where although the translation gives "child" instead of "babe," yet the Greek shows the same word *νήπιος* used in both places.

Of the Apocryphal books of the New Testament⁴⁵ it is unnecessary to say more than this:—

I. That beside our Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, no Christian history, claiming to be written by an apostle or apostolic man, is quoted within 300 years after the birth of Christ.

II. Of apocryphal writings only two are mentioned in the first three centuries without express terms of condemnation.

III. 1. There is no evidence that any spurious or apocryphal books whatever existed in the first century; in which century all our historical books are proved to have been extant.

2. These apocryphal writings were not read in the churches.

3. They were not admitted into the volume of the early Christians.

4. They do not appear in their catalogues.

5. They were not noticed by their adversaries.

6. They were not alleged by different parties as of authority in their controversies.

7. They were not the subjects of commentaries, versions, collations, or expositions.

8. They were rejected by all Christian writers in succeeding ages.

9. The very existence of these books is a tribute to the worth of the books that have been received. For they are imitations. They are not contradictions to our histories, but only unauthorized additions.

⁴⁵ "The Protevangelion," "The | Teaching of the Apostles," "The Gospel of the Infancy," "The | Shepherd," &c., &c.

CHAPTER IV.

“It is one thing to wish to have Truth on our side, and another thing to wish sincerely to be on the side of Truth.”—ARCHBISHOP WHATELEY.

“Nothing is a surer token of extreme baseness of spirit, than not to wish for the reality of eternal promises.”—PASCAL.

AT this stage of the argument an objector may say, I cannot deny the force of the preceding statements. I am ready to admit, fully and without reserve, that the canonical books of the Old and New Testament are neither spurious nor fictitious; that they are the genuine productions of the writers whose names they bear, and that they relate actual matters of fact. *But* this does not satisfy me. Before you demand my undoubting credence for the contents of these books, you must shew me that we now have them as their authors left them; that they are, substantially at least, the same now as then; that they have been preserved, uninterpolated, unmutilated, uncorrupted: in other words you must prove to me **THE INTEGRITY OF THE TEXT.**

In reply to this very reasonable demand, it should be observed first that it narrows the question so much as almost to remove all ground of question. For by admitting the books in mass it admits our fundamental proposition. And although it requires a scrupulous examination of the books in detail, it requires no more than we ourselves require. Our proposition embraces these two points:—First, the reception of the Text as inspired men left it; and second, the reception of such modern copies and versions of that text as cannot be shewn to be at variance with the original. On the first, the objector and ourselves are fully agreed. On the second, we say that if he ventures to reject modern versions on the ground of such

variance supposed, he is bound to shew that the alleged variations exist. Let him do so, and he will find us as ready to expunge and renounce these variations as he is himself; but if he fail in the attempt—and as far as he may fail—let him accept the consequence, and admit the purity and integrity of the modern text.

Meantime we may proceed to state a few of the principal facts which go to prove that our English Bible in the Authorized Version is, for all practical, if not for all critical purposes, the very same as that which was contained in the original documents, and uttered in the original tongues.

I. And first as to the Old Testament.

1. The Samaritan Pentateuch—a copy of the Hebrew Scriptures—was made and preserved by a people who, after the Babylonish captivity (536 B.C.) became the most bitter enemies of the Jews, so that whatever agreement subsists between this copy and the original cannot be considered as the result of design.¹

2. The Septuagint—a Translation into Greek, of the whole of the Old Testament, was begun nearly three hundred years before Christ,² by order of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and in subsequent reigns was completed, and widely circulated.

3. On comparing this Hebrew Samaritan Pentateuch, and this Greek translation, we find them substantially to agree with each other, and with our Bible.

4. The testimony of Josephus (as already cited) proves the

¹ The Samaritan Text is precisely the same as the Hebrew Text, with the exception of being somewhat fuller, and being written in Samaritan characters, which probably, are the older forms of Hebrew, or Phœnician. Though known and cited by several ancient fathers, (e. g. Eusebius and Cyril,) yet it afterwards fell into oblivion for upwards of a thousand years, so that its very existence began to be questioned. Its subsequent discovery was due to the learned Joseph Scaliger. At

length, after much labor and delay, six copies were procured from the East at the expence of that liberal and enlightened prelate, Abp. Usher. At a later date, Kennicott collected sixteen. Though not a source of valuable independent emendation, it is of great value in determining the history of the Hebrew vowels, and in confirming the general accuracy of the present text.

² Some writers hold it to have been *completed* by 285 B.C.

scrupulous care with which the Jews were accustomed to guard the purity of the sacred text. They even enacted a law which denounced him to be guilty of inexpiable sin, who should presume to make the slightest alteration in their sacred books. Accordingly, they have never dared to annex to them any historical narrative since the death of their last prophet Malachi. They closed the sacred volume with the succession of their prophets.

5. Not only were the Jewish Scriptures referred to by our Lord Himself as the word of God, but, what is more observable, frequently as he reproved the Jews themselves for making that Word of none effect through their tradition, He never accused them of corrupting the text.³

6. We have already seen that the books of the Old Testament as received by Christians now, are acknowledged by the Jews themselves to be those, and those only, which were received as divine in our Saviour's time. It now remains to be added that, by the confession of both parties, they have been handed down to us uncorrupted and unchanged. To substantiate this statement we need only to refer to the collation of the various versions. The versions themselves are innumerable. Among the most important MSS. may be named (in addition to the LXX., and the Hebrew Samaritan Pentateuch),

a. The Targums. The Targum, or interpretation of Onkelos, translates the Pentateuch into Chaldaic Hebrew (though of the purest order), and was written about sixty years before Christ. The Targum of Jonathan on the Prophets and historical books, was written about the commencement of the Christian era.⁴ In the fourth century, Joseph the Blind wrote a Targum on the Hagiographa ; and a little later, various similar versions of other

³ Ma. vii. 9, 13; Matt. xv. 6; Is. i. 12.

⁴ The Chaldee paraphrases, called Targums or Versions, are translations of the Old Testament from the Hebrew into Chaldee, made for the benefit of those who, after the captivity, had forgotten, or were ignorant of the Hebrew.

They were read publicly with the original Hebrew, sentence for sentence alternately. See Neh. ch. viii. v. 8. The two most ancient and authentic, are those above mentioned : that of Onkelos on the Law ; and that of Jonathan on the Prophets.

parts of Scripture were published. These Targums, ten in all, are of great value in determining the Text of Scripture, being, for the most part, very literal paraphrases of the original Hebrew.

b. The versions of Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus. Aquila was a Jew, and his version, which is extremely literal, was read by the Jews in their synagogues. It is quoted by Justin Martyr (A. D. 160) and Irenæus (A. D. 176.) The version of Theodotion appeared about the same time, and is quoted by the same authors. The version of Symmachus is of later date, and is expressed in plain elegant language without being a literal translation. These three texts were in the hands of Origen in the year A. D. 228, and were used by him in revising the text of the Septuagint. They are now lost, but their important variations are preserved in the Hexaplarian text of the Seventy, published by Montfaucon at Paris, 1713.

c. The Peshito (or *literal*) Syriac Version of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures belongs probably to the first century. It was in general use among the Syrian churches in the year 378, and is then quoted by Ephrem the Syrian as the version generally received, and so ancient as to require frequent explanation. The true Philoxenian or New Syrian belongs to the 6th century, and the Haraclean (commonly called the Philoxenian) to the 7th. Both versions take their name from the persons under whose sanction they were made. The Peshito being, as its name implies, very *literal*, is of great value in determining the original text.

d. So also for this purpose is the Vulgate itself; although the present state of its text is very corrupt. It was made by Jerome about the year 385. Part of it, including the New Testament, he took from an older Latin version, called the Old Italic, which is quoted by Tertullian in the year 220; but the greater part he himself translated from the original of the Old Testament. This version was gradually adopted by the Latin church, and was the first book ever printed.

e. In the 3rd and 4th centuries, parts of the Old Testament (and the whole of the New) were translated into Coptic (or Memphitic,) the language of Lower Egypt, the Copts being

Egyptian Christians: and also into Sahidic (or Thebaic,) the language of Upper Egypt. In the 4th century a translation was made into Ethiopic, the language spoken in Ethiopia, the country of Candace and the modern Abyssinia. In the 5th century was completed a version into Armenian, under the care of Miesrob, the inventor of the Armenian alphabet: and also into Gothic under Ulphilas. In the 6th, a version of the whole Bible into Georgian; and in the 9th century was published a version of the Bible into the Slavonic or old Russian language, of great critical value.

f. The MSS. of the Hebrew Scriptures, now extant, were most of them written between the years A. D. 1000, and A. D. 1457. Some of them however belong to the 8th and 9th centuries. The MSS. of the Septuagint (or Greek translation of the Old) as well as those of the New Testament are earlier still. The Alexandrian MS. (Codex Alexandrinus, called A by Wetstein, Griesbach, and other critics), now in the British Museum, comprising in four volumes, small folio, both Old and New Testaments, must have been written before the close of the fifth century.⁵ The Vatican MS. (called B), preserved in the library of the Vatican at Rome, belongs to the 4th, as does probably the Codex Cottonianus (I), the remains of which are now in the British Museum, the various readings of the whole being preserved in the works of Archbishop Usher. The Codex Regius or Ephremi (C), belongs to the 6th century.⁶ The

⁵ The warrant for this assertion—"must have been"—is furnished by the fact that the peculiarities of the various MSS. constitute tests of age. Thus the oldest MSS. are in capital or uncial letters, without any division of words or sentences, without accents or ornaments, and with very few pause marks. In those of later ages we find successively the canons of Eusebius; the art of illumination; the divisions of Euthalius; a system of punctuation; the cursive style of writing

(in small letters); and the modern division into chapters. Thus, while a MS. on cotton cannot be of earlier date than the 11th century, one on the finest parchment and with uncial letters of gold and silver might—and in all probability would—belong to the age of Chrysostom, A.D. 360.

⁶ This is an invaluable manuscript. It is called the Codex *Regius*, from being deposited in the *Royal Library* at Paris: the name Ephraemi was given to it because over the first part of it

Codex Bezae (D), given by the reformer Beza to the University of Cambridge, belongs (in the opinion of Wetstein) to the 5th century ; critics who give it least antiquity, assigning it to the 6th or 7th.

g. In the case of the Greek and Roman classics, twenty or even ten MSS. are deemed amply sufficient to form an accurate text : there are known to critics fifteen MSS. of Herodotus, of which the most ancient belongs to the 10th century ; and this is a fair average of the ancient MSS. of classic authors. It is obvious therefore, that the advantage in this respect, is greatly on the side of the Scriptures. Dr. Kennicott collated for his critical edition of the Hebrew Bible, not ten or twenty, but six hundred and thirty of these MSS. ; and De Rossi collated seven hundred and thirty-four more. This large number of MSS. has afforded ample provision for restoring the text to its original purity, and at the same time gives ABSOLUTE SECURITY against extensive corruptions.⁷

A Virgil in the Vatican, claims an antiquity as high as the 4th century ; but generally, the MSS. of the classics belong to periods between the 10th and the 15th centuries. In antiquity, therefore, as well as in numbers, they are greatly inferior to the MSS. of the Scriptures.

II. With respect to the New Testament, it is important to observe, in addition to the evidence presented by the agreement of very ancient MSS. and Versions still extant

1. That it was in the earliest times very widely circulated ; so that any alteration would have been quickly discovered.

2. That it was held in the highest reverence ; was received as a Divine rule of faith and practice ; was received as such to the rejection of many others pretending to inspiration ; was

was written part of the smaller works of Ephraim the Syrian ; this MS. being one of the class called "Rescripti" (or $\pi\alpha\lambdaιμ\downarrow\eta\sigma\tau\omega\iota$) that is "twice-written" (or "rubbed again").

⁷ Of the Old Testament, a careful examiner has noted 1314 various readings of value. Of these,

566 are adopted in the English version ; 147 of the whole number affect the sense, but none can be regarded as theologically important. Generally, they correct a date, or complete the sense. (See Hamilton's *Codex Criticus*. Lond. 1821.)

thus received by those who were called upon to lay down their lives in proof of their belief, and who therefore would exercise the greatest jealousy over the preservation of these writings unaltered.

3. Another, and most important fact is this:—The New Testament has been incomparably more quoted than any other book in the world: quoted by a succession of writers from the very time of its being written to the present day, and those quotations agree with our Scriptures. If we confine our attention to the authors of the early age of the Christian church, we shall find that in no less than one hundred and eighty ecclesiastical writers (whose works are still extant) quotations from the New Testament are introduced; and so numerous are they, that “from the works of those who flourished before the seventh century, the whole text of the New Testament might have been recovered, even if the originals had since perished.” The experiment was tried by Dr. Bentley, and he confirms this statement.

4. As before the coming of our Lord, the enmity of the Jews and the Samaritans was overruled to the preservation of the Old Testament unaltered, so since his advent, the enmity of the Jews and Christians, and the divisions of Christians among themselves, have prevented any corruption of the New Testament. For no alteration could have been attempted by one, which would have not been quickly detected by another party.

III. In conclusion. Such is a sample of the evidence by which it is proved that in the first century of the Christian era (and in the case of the Old Testament, at least two centuries earlier), there existed and were known throughout the Roman world books called the Sacred Scriptures, written by inspired men, and that **THE PRESENT TEXT OF THE BIBLE IS IDENTICAL WITH THE TEXT WHICH THOSE BOOKS CONTAINED.**

Decisive as these facts are, they give a very inadequate idea of the amount of proof of which the genuineness and integrity of the Scriptures are susceptible. The MSS. are innumerable. They belong to all ages: and many of them are very ancient. They have been kept for centuries in distant parts of the world, under the custody of opposing sects, and in circumstances that made extensive or important alterations impossible.

Copyists preserved them with the utmost reverence, counting every letter of every book, and registering the very tittles of the law.⁸ How remarkable, how decisive as an evidence of Divine care, that while all the libraries of Europe and of the world, containing copies of the Sacred Scriptures have been examined; all ancient versions extant compared; the MSS. of all countries from the third to the sixteenth century collated; the commentaries of all the Fathers again and again investigated; nothing has been discovered—not even a single general reading—which can set aside any important passage hitherto received as genuine. This negative conclusion, that our Bible does not essentially differ from the Bible of the Primitive Church, is indeed an ample recompense for all the labor and time which have been devoted to these pursuits.

In explanation of the expression that our Bible does not *essentially* differ from the Bible of the Primitive Church, we may notice what the various readings of the New Testament involve.

In the Epistle to the Romans, for example, which contains 433 verses, there are at most four passages,⁹ the meaning of

⁸ They marked the number of the greater and smaller sections, chapters, verses, words, and letters, in each book, placing the amount at the end of each in numerical letters, or some symbolical word which comprised them; noted the verses in which something appeared to be omitted, the words which they believed to be changed, the superfluous letters, the repetitions of the same verses, the different readings of the redundant or defective words, the number of times the same word is found at the beginning, middle, and end of a verse, the different significations of the same word, the agreement or conjunction of the same word with another, and what letters are pronounced, inverted, and hung per-

pendicularly, with the number of each. They also reckoned which is the middle letter of the Pentateuch; the middle verse of each book; and how many times each letter of the alphabet occurred in the whole Hebrew Scriptures. Trifling and superstitious as this has appeared to some; others have seen in the pious zeal and industry exerted even in so many tedious and vexatious researches, the special providence of that Divine hand which has thus preserved the integrity and honour of the Divine Word, by putting a stop to the licentiousness, rashness, or carelessness of transcribers and critics.

⁹ According to Scholz there are only three; and although Griesbach has four, more modern critics.

which is modified by readings which Griesbach deems of weight:—

In ch. vii. 6, for “*that being dead* in which we were held,” he reads “*We being dead to that* in which we were held:” a difference in the original between *o* and *e*. So some editions of the received text (*ἀποθανόντες* for *ἀποθανόντος*.)

In ch. xi. 6, he omits the latter half of the verse.

In ch. xii. 11, he reads “time” for “Lord;” *αὐτός* for *υπό*.

In ch. xvi. 5, he reads the first fruits of *Asia*, for *Achaia*.

These are the only corrections that affect the sense, and they are all unimportant. To make them he examined first all the principal MSS. already named (i.e. MSS. written in *uncial* letters or Greek capitals, and supposed to be thirteen or fourteen hundred years old); and afterwards one hundred and ten MSS. in *small letters*; together with thirty others, the greater part of which came from Mount Athos, collated by Matthæi, who travelled over a great part of Russia and Asia for this purpose.

In the Epistle to the Galatians the important corrections are three only:

In ch. iv. 17, for *you* in the second clause he reads *us*: a change in the original of one letter;

In ch. iv. 26, he omits the word “*all*;”

In ch. v. 19, he omits the word “*adultery*;”

Corrections which make no difference in the sense.

In the seven thousand nine hundred and fifty-nine verses of the New Testament there are not more than ten or twelve various readings of great importance, and these AFFECT NOT THE DOCTRINES OF SCRIPTURE, but only the number of proof passages in which the doctrines are revealed. But even with respect to these ten or twelve important various readings sanctioned by Griesbach, it is to be observed that, “oracle of modern criticism” though he be, still, he is not infallible. In some of these important passages it has long seemed highly probable that his corrections were mistaken and wrong; and the progress of further research has given to this probability the force of positive demonstration.

have retained but two of these, and these two the most unimportant of the four. Such is the

admirable integrity of the “incom-
ruptible” word!

His alteration of Acts xx. 28, is a case in point. For “the church of God,” he substituted “the church of the Lord;” a change depending on a single letter ($\bar{K}\bar{T}$ instead of $\bar{\Theta}\bar{T}$). Lachmann and Tischendorf did the same. But Scholz and Hahn preserved the ancient, i.e. the received text. And Alford, who in the first instance followed Tischendorf, has in the last revision of his second volume, returned to the reading of the received text, and assigned most satisfactory reasons for the change. And, not to mention other authorities, it may suffice to observe that the very weighty suffrage of the Codex Vaticanus has (by recent publication) been given on the same side. For as this is the most ancient of all the witnesses to which we can appeal with regard to the text of the New Testament, and one of the most accurately written of all existing MSS., its evidence may be deemed conclusive.

Similar is his correction of the text in 1 Ti. iii. 16; where again the difference is that of a single letter (or, in some MSS., merely the supposed omission of a mark; O for Θ). Here too he is at variance with Scholz and Hahn, both of whom adhere to the reading of the received text. The word which Griesbach omits ($\Theta\epsilon\delta\varsigma$, God), Scholz affirms to be found in almost all the Greek MSS. He says he found it in the eighty-six manuscripts which he himself examined.

And to cite but one other instance, the most important of those four unimportant which have been already specified in the Epistle to the Romans. The majority of the MSS. do not appear to justify even the change of the two letters adopted by Griesbach in ch. xii. 11. For on this point, Whitby remarks that upwards of thirty MSS.—all the ancient versions—Clemens Alexandrinus, St. Basil and St. Jerome—all the writings of the Greek and Latin Fathers (St. Ambrose alone excepted)—followed the ancient text; and this text has been restored, too, both by Lachmann and Tittmann in their respective editions of the New Testament. Scholz, in his edition of 1836, has done the same.

The truth appears to be, that notwithstanding all his merits, Griesbach is but too justly liable to the charge, which by so many scholars (Matthæi, Nolan, Lawrence, Scholz, and others,) is preferred against him: he is too eager to admit new readings

into the ancient text. The force of habit sufficiently accounts for his proneness to fall into this snare. Whitby had occasion, and not without reason, to make a similar charge against Mill, who, however, never permitted himself to make so many corrections as Griesbach.

But even if the fact were otherwise ; if every one of Griesbach's corrections, however conjectural, could be thoroughly established ; what then ? Why then we should have ten or twelve various important readings, out of a range of verses numbering seven thousand nine hundred and fifty-nine ! and what are these among so many ? Why, the comedies of Terence—there are only six of them, and where they have been copied once, the New Testament has been copied a thousand times—and yet these comedies alone contain no fewer than thirty thousand variations ! Well then may we adopt the advice of the great Bengel who, nearly a hundred and fifty years ago,¹⁰ after long and laborious research into these topics, wrote to his scholar Reuss, “ Eat the Scripture bread in simplicity, just as you have it ; and do not be disturbed if here and there you find a grain of sand which the mill-stone may have suffered to pass. . . . If the Holy Scriptures which have been so often copied, were absolutely without variations, this would be so great a miracle that faith in them would be no longer faith. I am astonished, on the contrary, that from all these transcriptions, there has not resulted a greater number of various readings.” Well may we acquiesce in the language of Gaussen, who observes as the result of these investigations that the “ text is found more pure than the most pious ventured to hope ; and that the opponents of inspiration have been compelled to come to the same conclusion.” There were not wanting those indeed who, as the result of the various readings, exultingly anticipated that (to use their own terms) all exclusive, positive, evangelical belief, would be scattered to the winds. “ But it has not been thus. It is now a suit terminated ; the plaintiffs are cast at their own appeal ; the inquest having been held by modern criticism : all the judges—even the bench of Rationalists—have unanimously pronounced it a lost cause, and declared that the objectors must

¹⁰ In 1721.

go to some other quarter for argument.”¹¹ The Divine word, inspired eighteen centuries ago, is the same word now in our possession ; and holding the Sacred Text in one hand, and all the readings which science has collected from seven hundred manuscripts in the other,¹² we can exclaim, with devout and adoring gratitude, “I now hold in my favoured hand the eternal word of my God.”

¹¹ See Michaelis, vol. ii. p. 266. Eichhorn, *Einleitung*, vol. ii. p. 700.

¹² Scholz quotes 674 for the Gospels alone.

CHAPTER V.

SECTION I : INTERPRETATION.

WHO that has ever read Cowper's pleasant application of it, can forget the fate of the Mahometan prohibition of pork ?

“ There is a part in every swine
No friend nor follower of mine
May taste, whate'er his inclination,
On pain of excommunication.”

But people who liked pork were not long in finding means to evade such a prohibition as this ; and—after their own fashion—to justify the evasion.

“ — For one piece they thought it hard
From the whole hog to be debarr'd ;
And set their wit at work to find
What joint the prophet had in mind.
Much controversy straight arose,
These chose the back, the belly those ;
By some 'tis confidently said
He meant not to forbid the head ;
While others at that doctrine rail,
And piously prefer the tail.
Thus conscience freed from every clog,
Mahometans eat up the hog.

* * * * *

Reviled and loved, renounced and followed,
Thus, bit by bit, the whole is swallowed ;
Each thinks his neighbour makes too free,
Yet likes a slice as well as he ;
With sophistry their sauce they sweeten,
Till quite from tail to snout 'tis eaten.”

It is the old story : “ Where there's a will there's a way.” These Turks are not unlike the ancient conqueror of Amalek, who did not despair of hiding even his flagrant disobedience

under the transparent sophism “Yea I *have* obeyed the voice of the Lord.” Or, they are like the modern champion of “Repeal,” frankly avowing that he could “drive a coach-and-six through any Act of Parliament that could be made.” In all these cases we see the operation of the same principle. He who begins by loving a lie, will end by making one. And no laws, human or divine, can escape a perverse interpretation where the judgment is allowed to be biassed by a perverted inclination.

But further. If even the legal precision of Acts of Parliament is not free from a diversity of interpretation, how much less should ordinary writing be so? narratives, letters, history, biography, allegory, parable, poetry? Yet this is the kind of writing which constitutes the Bible. It may not be difficult to procure an otiose assent to a system of generalities which denies no one’s opinion, opposes no one’s interest, and disturbs no one’s ease. But the case is widely altered when we have to do with a book which disclaims an otiose assent, as no assent at all; which succumbs to no supposed self-interest; which spares no pet opinion; and which with equal vigour denounces our ease and demands our earnestness. Such a book is the Bible. And yet it is of this Bible, treating the profoundest subjects, involving the most momentous interests, and relating to the daily life of the millions of mankind; treating these themes not in the language of the senate or the forum, but in the common speech that appeals to the common understanding of our race, and traverses the avenues of the heart; it is of such a book as this that Professor Jowett has had the simplicity to say, “It is a strange, though familiar fact, that great differences of opinion exist respecting the interpretation of Scripture.” In view of the character of the Bible, considered as human literature, or in view of that character considered as Divine Revelation, but especially in that view which combines both these aspects, we may agree with him in regarding the fact as familiar, while we remain surprised beyond measure that he, or any one else, should consider it strange.

Take an illustration from our great dramatist. When Oberon, the fairy-king, in his own exquisite language, tells his follower “gentle Puck” what happened when he

“—heard a mermaid, on a dolphin’s back,
Uttering such dulcet and harmonious breath,
That the rude sea grew civil at her song ;
And certain stars shot madly from their spheres
To hear the sea-maid’s music ;”

who can fail to perceive the delicate yet scarcely covert allusion to the fair but hapless Mary, Queen of Scots, and to the ruin in which her fascinations had involved the Duke of Norfolk, and the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland? Or who can fail to recognize the last of the Tudors in the superb compliment paid to Elizabeth, that “fair Vestal, throned by the west,” “the imperial votaress,”

“ In maiden meditation, fancy-free ? ”

In the third Act of “King John,” the king darkly intimates to Hubert his desire for the assassination of his nephew and rival, Arthur. In the fourth Act, Hubert apprises the king of the universal horror and discontent which had been produced by the execution of his fatal orders ; and when John throws on his too ready instrument the responsibility for the murder, and Hubert answers

“ Here is your hand and seal for what I did ;”

the king replies in the well-known passage—

“ How oft the sight of means to do ill deeds
Makes deeds ill done ! Hadst *thou* not been by,
A fellow by the hand of nature marked,
Quoted, and signed, to do a deed of shame,
This murder had not come into my mind.
But taking note of thy abhorred aspect,
Finding thee fit for bloody villany,
Apt, liable to be employed in danger,
I faintly broke with thee of Arthur’s death ;
And thou, to be endeared to a king,
Made it no conscience to destroy a prince.

* * * * *

Out of my sight, and never see me more ! ”

Now when we remember that the whole of this scene is a pure invention ; and that there is no authority in the historians of king John’s reign for the participation of such a person as Hubert in Arthur’s murder,—if indeed Arthur was really murdered at all,—or even for Hubert’s existence ; we may well ask

ourselves if it be possible that Shakspeare invented such an incident, and such a personage, without perceiving the correspondence of both with the case of Davison ? Or could the obvious application of the parable to Elizabeth be overlooked by the audience at the distance of only eleven years from the death of Mary ? For that application becomes more obvious when we compare the conduct attributed to John with the actual conduct of Elizabeth. On receiving the intelligence of Mary's execution, her surprise and resentment appeared unbounded. Her grief exhibited itself first in mute astonishment, and then in lamentable wailings. She chased her ministers from her presence. She accused them of having put her dear kinswoman to death, contrary to her fixed purpose. She prosecuted Secretary Davison for having despatched to Fotheringay, without her consent, the death-warrant which he had prevailed on her to sign. She obtained a judgment condemning him to pay to herself a fine of £10,000 ; and to be imprisoned during her pleasure ; and she actually caused that sentence to be executed to the letter. There seems therefore to be no slight ground for holding Warburton's opinion, that the similitude between the two cases was not accidental, but designed. And even those who dissent from that opinion in this case are not slow to adopt it in others.

It was in September 1599 that Essex arrived in England, a fugitive from his army in Ireland, and under the heavy displeasure of the Court for his treaty with the Irish rebels. His friends and kinsmen, Rutland and Southampton, shared his disgrace, though, while *he* was committed to the custody of the Lord Keeper Bacon, *they* remained at large, passing their time and soothing their mortification (as we learn from the Sydney Papers) by "going daily to the plays." In the following spring, when the fate of these three eminent courtiers must have been the common topic of discourse, "As You Like It" was first brought on the stage. "Read over that incomparable description of the safety and quietness of a life passed in rural scenes and engagements, when contrasted with the calamities to which councillors and statesmen are exposed, and you will perhaps agree with Mr. Knight that Shakspeare intended to direct the thoughts of his audience to the then recent degrada-

tion of Essex, Rutland, and Southampton, if not to suggest to the sufferers themselves the possibility of being happy in despite of fortune. With this view of the probable, or at least of the possible, meaning of that most fascinating of all pastorals, listen to the language of the exiled Duke :—

‘ Now, my co-mates and brothers in exile,
 Hath not old custom made this life more sweet
 Than that of painted pomp ? Are not these woods
 More free from peril than the envious court ?
 Here feel we but the penalty of Adam,
 The seasons’ difference ; as the icy fang,
 And churlish chiding of the winter’s wind ;
 Which when it bites and blows upon my body,
 E’en till I shrink with cold, I smile and say—
 This is no flattery ; these are counsellors
 That feelingly persuade me what I am.
 Sweet are the uses of adversity,
 Which, like the toad, ugly and venomous,
 Wears yet a precious jewel in his head :
 And this our life, exempt from public haunt,
 Finds tongues in trees, books in the running brooks,
 Sermons in stones, and good in every thing.’

Or hear the moralizing of the melancholy Jaques over ‘ the poor sequestered stag, that from the hunter’s aim had ta’en a hurt ;’ when ‘ a careless herd, full of the pasture, jumps along by him, and never stays to greet him.’

‘ Ay, quoth Jaques,
 Swcep on, you fat and greasy citizens ;
 ’Tis just the fashion ! Wherefore do you look
 Upon that poor and broken bankrupt there ? ’

If Essex read, and if Rutland and Southampton really heard, all this, assuredly they did not read and hear it unmoved.’¹ Nor perhaps (as Mr. Knight suggests), did the shaft from the sounding bow of the poet leave unwounded the heart of Francis Bacon himself. When writhing, as we know from his own letters that he did writhing, under universal reproach for his conduct to his benefactor Essex, what censure could sting him so keenly as the song of Amiens in this drama ?—

“ Blow, blow, thou winter wind,
 Thou art not so unkind
 As man’s ingratitude ;

¹ Sir James Stephen, on “ Desultory and Systematic Reading.”

Thy tooth is not so keen,
Because *thou* art not seen,
Although thy breath be rude :
Freeze, freeze, thou bitter sky,
'Thou dost not bite so nigh
As benefits forgot ;
Though thou the waters warp,
Thy sting is not so sharp
As friend remembered not."

Now let it be supposed that these constructions of Shakspeare's latent meaning are erroneous, and that in these passages he had no real design to comment on the memorable occurrences of his own times ; they still prove that in ordinary literature—where there are no personal interests affected, where there is no relation to the future, and no pretension to the supernatural—it is impossible to avoid a diversity of interpretation ; that the highest authorities are found not merely on different, but even on opposite sides ; and that what one believes to be merely superficial and literal, the other maintains to be mainly mystical and allegorical.

Admit now the supernatural, and who will not see how largely you have increased the difficulties of interpretation ? Turn to Æschylus : and listen to the warnings of his latest English editor, the accomplished scholar selected by the conductors of the *Bibliotheca Classica*. "He is difficult, because he is profound ; or in other words, because he treats of matters beyond the reach of man's ordinary knowledge and perceptions. . . . He is fond of dwelling on the principles of divine action in relation to man ; but he rarely expresses his sentiments on these subjects in plain and ordinary language, but employs terms mystical, figurative, and sometimes grammatically obscure. He has a system before him, uniform, connected, and consistent ; but he gives us mere glimpses of it here and there, which, without the additional light of other passages, would hardly guide us through the intricacies of the subject. . . . Hence, there is a continual reference to the ideas of expiation, propitiation, and averting of possible ills. . . . Though here and there, perhaps, doubts occur as to the right reading of words, we cannot help feeling that the views of the author as to the

attributes of the Divine Mind are the real difficulties which we have to encounter, and which lie beyond the province of the mere critic or grammarian. . . In such passages as these—and they are very numerous—there is literally, scarcely a word that does not involve a doctrine, a metaphor, or a meaning, that lies below the surface. . . The supernatural was his delight. And he treats these subjects with the earnestness of a poet who had a firm belief in their reality, and in their playing an important part in human affairs.”²

It would be alike irreverent and untrue to apply to the sacred penmen the whole of this most just piece of criticism. Yet it contains a good deal which, with slight modification, might be so applied. And if thus much can be urged as regards the difficulties of a solitary genius, what shall be said of the varied styles and subjects that meet us in the Bible? Is it, after all, the *fact*, mentioned by Mr. Jowett, that is strange? Or rather, does not the strangeness lie in the circumstance that any one should think it strange?

Take but one instance more. Dante treats largely of the supernatural. “Now those portions of the ‘Divina Commedia’ which are the least interwoven with the events and interests of his time, and range within the ethereal courts, are precisely those which are the most difficult to understand. The ‘Paradiso,’ as a whole, is decidedly the hardest of the three divisions. And do his interpreters agree together? Is it not, on the contrary, notorious that there may almost be said to be opposite schools of criticism concerning him? Does the apparent introduction of the celebrated Countess Matilda, in the twenty-eighth canto of the ‘Purgatorio,’ mean more than meets the ear? Beatrice herself, how far is she the departed lady of the house of Portinari, whom Dante knew in youth; how far a personification of the queen of sciences, Theology? One of the most anti-allegorizing and matter-of-fact critics of the poem, the eminent French *litterateur* M. Fauriel, speaks as follows of the two opening scenes of the poet’s alarm at the three wild beasts, and of his rescue by the three beatified spirits.—‘The first of these

² *Æschylus Tragædiae*. Ed. Paley (Preface), London, 1855.

two scenes is evidently allegoric, both as a whole, and in its details. It is not reasonably possible to understand literally that horrible forest where Dante has lost his way; that smiling ascent by which he seeks to escape, or those three beasts that bar his passage; all this is evidently symbolical; all this has been interpreted in *as many various senses as* Dante has had *commentators*, translators or admirers. All goes to prove that Dante died the sole possessor of the secret of this allegory. . . . Is this second scene allegorical, like the first, to which it belongs? Are these three ladies who concert and agree to come to Dante's assistance in his distress, symbols also like the wild beasts? Are they ideas, or fictions personified? Is Beatrice theology, or philosophy, or some other of the sciences cultivated by Dante, and not Beatrice, daughter of Folco Portinari, wife of a Florentine of the house of the Bardi, who died at Florence in 1290? I am aware that almost all commentators have interpreted this second scene allegorically as well as the first; but I have examined their interpretations; I have carefully compared them with Dante's own words; and the more I reflect on them the more I felt they were inadmissible. So strong is my opinion, and my conviction on this point, that even were it historically proved that Dante wished to treat this part of his poem allegorically and to represent theology under the form of Beatrice, I should admit the intention without being able to believe in its accomplishment: I should persist in maintaining that such as it is represented in the passage we are speaking of, the figure of Beatrice is incapable of an allegorical interpretation.' Now we are perfectly well aware of the strong repugnance to the latter part of this criticism which will be felt by many admirers of the great Florentine. Be it so; we have not the slightest wish to commit either ourselves or our readers to the views of M. Fauriel. All that we ask is, *if men of sense and of high ability can differ so widely upon the meaning of a single canto of a most deeply studied poet, is it so very wonderful that they should differ on the interpretation of the Bible?*³ . . . The great poem of Dante is but the work of a single man, and its interpretation can only very indirectly

³ The italics are the author's.

affect our consciences. Few grounds for dissension over its meaning can be assigned which are not applicable, with tenfold force, to the words of Holy Scripture."⁴ In short, a book marked by the cluster of characteristics here glanced at must of necessity involve difficulties, must of necessity excite differences. Writings on that which is supernatural are likely to be harder to understand than those which only concern that which is natural. A collection of writings of various authors is usually harder than a work which is the production of a single mind. And if the meaning of words is allowed to interpenetrate the moral and spiritual life of millions; if numbers have for centuries looked beyond the text, in the belief that a personal Mind has guided the writers, and given to their language a significance beyond that which they intended; then the very circumstance of so much being at stake will add, indeed, to the keenness of inquiry, but will almost infallibly introduce new elements of dissension.

But although we can by no means admit the strangeness of Professor Jowett's "familiar fact," we may safely affirm the strangeness of his proposed remedy. We have seen the treatment to which other books are subjected, and the interminable differences which are the result of that treatment. Will it be believed that that is the very treatment which, in the case of the Bible, Professor Jowett recommends in order to get rid of differences? Is it not almost incredible that the new specific should be none other than the old one, so often tried, and so often followed by failure?

But Mr Jowett appears to think that there is at least one instance in which it has not been followed by failure; and this instance he finds in "the Vedas and the Zendavesta, though beset by obscurities of language probably greater than are found in any portion of the Bible."⁵ It is an instance which will not serve his purpose. He could hardly have chosen one more damaging to his cause. Take the books which the Hindus

⁴ "On Certain Characteristics of
Holy Scriptures:" a most able and
seasonable Pamphlet by J. G. Cazenove, M.A. London: J. and
C. Mosley.

⁵ Essays and Reviews, p. 335.

esteem as sacred. Are there no differences of opinion respecting their authority and interpretation? Let those who doubt what reply should be made to this question, turn to that invaluable work of Professor Max Müller which bears upon the subject.⁶ Therein he may read of the Sruti, which are held to be revealed, and the Sûtras based upon them, but avowedly attributed to human authors; a distinction which has exercised "a great influence on the religious struggles of India." Or again, how local varieties of accent and pronunciation crept in, were sanctioned by the traditions of different families or schools, and could not be given up, because there was no way of determining the proper mode, and yet an improper mode was held in some cases to change the meaning. Or again, how difficulties have arisen, not wholly unlike those which divide Protestants and Romanists on the subject of the Apocrypha. "No orthodox Brahmin would for a moment admit that Brâhmanas and Sûtras belonged to the same class of literature. They fear the danger of such an admission, because as Kumarila says, 'If the name of Sruti were once granted to the Sûtras, it would with difficulty be denied to the sacred writings of Buddhists, and other heretics.'" In short, in the words of the learned Professor himself, "The philosophical chapters, well known under the name of Upanishads, are almost the only portion of Vedic literature which is extensively read to this day. They contain, or are supposed to contain, the highest authority on which the various systems of philosophy in India rest. Not only the Vedânta philosopher, who by his very name professes his faith in the ends and objects of the Veda, but the Sâṅkhya, the Vaïseshika, the Nyâya, and Yoga philosophers, all pretend to find in the Upanishads some warranty for their tenets, however antagonistic in their bearing. The same applies to the numerous sects that have existed, and still exist in India. Their founders, if they have any pretensions to orthodoxy, invariably appeal to some passage in the Upanishads in order to substantiate their own reasonings."⁷

We all know how, between Arian and Athanasian, Calvinist

⁶ History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature. London: Williams and Norgate.

⁷ Ibid. p. 316.

and Arminian, Protestant and Romanist, a different reading in a single verse of Scripture may be held to affect thought and practice. Let it not be forgotten that, on the strength of a single false reading in the Rigveda, thousands of lives have been sacrificed, and a fanatical rebellion threatened. The humane and ultimately successful endeavours of the English Government to stop the practice of widow-burning in India, was resisted on the authority of the corrupt change of the word *agre* (altar) into *agneh* (fire).⁸

The Koran may be instanced as another illustration on the same side; although there have not been wanting those who, with an amount of ignorance surpassing even their ill-will, have dared to point to the followers of Mahomet as an exemplification of perfect unity. For simple as is the Koran in respect of structure, when compared with the complex framework of Holy Scripture, it is truly wonderful to witness the amount of difference of interpretation to which it has been subjected by those who accept it as divine. Are the Sonnites or the Shiites the truer representatives of the doctrine of the Koran? "Is the fatalism of the Koran meant to apply to all the affairs of life, or only to the spiritual ones? The Ulemas, the recognized authorities, say the latter; but they do not succeed in imparting this view to the mass of their co-religionists. Is it fair, with one of their infinitely numerous sects, the Dhaharites, to interpret the Koran literally, rejecting every allegorical and mystic sense, or with another sect, the Batenites, to press the latter almost exclusively? How far were those fierce and ardent Puritans of Islam, the Wahabees, justified, at the beginning of the present century, in their attempts to bring back Yemen, and Syria, and Egypt, and the holy cities of Mecca and Medina (which they seized), to a supposed Shiite conformity to the Koran? or ought men to approve the act of Ibrahim Pasha in sending their leader, Abdallah, to Constantinople for execution? Are the Motazali right in supposing that the Koran is created, or were those the more orthodox Moslems who, rather than admit so impious a doctrine, preferred to remain as slaves among the Christians, asserting with the

⁸ Prof. Max Müller in *Oxford Essays* for 1856. (Pp. 22, 3.)

majority of their brethren that the book was eternal—coeval with the Creator himself? And, lastly, not to prolong this series of questions, have the mystic sects, the Sofis, any basis in the teaching of the Koran? or was there some palliation for the announcement of the great Arab theologian, Gasali, that to slay one of these pantheising mystics, was a work “of greater merit before God than to give life to ten men?”⁹

Instead, therefore, of prolonging the utopian search after uniformity of interpretation, common sense will dictate the selection from among the many varieties that are false, of the one method that is true. Nor is this selection so utterly hopeless a task as many would have us believe. The assertion lately made, that “The book in which we believe all religious truth to be contained, is the most uncertain of all books, because interpreted by arbitrary and uncertain methods,” is as unjust as it is untrue. No doubt if we could collect in one mass all that has been written on the Bible, in criticism, commentary, and controversy, for eighteen hundred years, and winnow out all the chaff of error, ignorance, and folly, we might be almost choked and stifled by its vast amount. What else could be expected from a variety so immense as that of Biblical literature, reaching through so many ages and countries, and encountering a thousand tendencies to delusion and error in all of them? But “what is the chaff to the wheat?” Not merely how worthless in value, but how small in amount! If all the base coin throughout the empire were amassed in one sum, it would, no doubt, appear very formidable; but into what utter insignificance does it dwindle when compared with the millions of sterling currency! And not less trivial are the vagaries of a few enthusiasts, when compared with the demonstrable certainties of the great bulk of Biblical expositors. What would be thought, not merely of the science, but even of the sanity of a man who, collecting all the mistakes of astronomical theories, and all the errors of astronomical calculations, and mingling them with all the dreams of astrology, should

⁹ Cazenove: See also Pococke; and Major Price's Hist. of Mahomedanism.

then gravely pretend to maintain that by this parade of complexity and confusion he had proved astronomy to be the most uncertain of all the sciences ; and, further, that he alone proceeds scientifically and surely, who rejecting all instruments, and abandoning all theories, however firmly based on mathematical demonstration, with the copious accumulation of facts in so many observatories, should betake himself with the naked eye alone to the study of the heavens ? Yet this is precisely the absurdity propounded by some modern interpreters of the Bible. But after all, “The foundation standeth sure.” The Bible is the most certain of all books : and its theology the surest and highest of all sciences. To specify and illustrate the more essential principles of interpretation, with the rules founded thereon ; to show that they are neither arbitrary in their origin nor uncertain in their results ; and to establish their necessity by a reference to the invariably pernicious consequences of their violation or neglect ; will be the object of the remaining portion of this chapter.

CHAPTER VI.

SECTION II. PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION.

“I shall not ask Jean Jacques Rousseau
If birds confabulate or no ;
'Tis clear that they were always able
To hold discourse, at least in fable ;
And e'en the child who knows no better
Than to interpret by the letter,
A story of a cock and bull,
Must have a most uncommon skull.”

THOSE literalists who deprecate, though they cannot deny, the use of figurative language in Scripture, and who imagine that its avoidance would have rendered the language of Revelation more intelligible, and its meaning more indubitable, should be reminded that the realization of their idea, even if it were practicable, would still be most undesirable. If every paragraph of the Bible had exhibited all that exactness of legal precision which characterizes a parliamentary enactment ; what then ? Even this, as we have already seen, would not have prevented dissension and dispute. But even were this fact otherwise ; even if—contrary to all experience, and contrary to the very nature of things—we admit for the moment that this supposed uniformity of expression were attainable ; and then admit further—that this too is opposed to all experience—that when attained it answered the desired end, *i.e.* prevented the possibility of misinterpretation or mistake ; what then ? Who would be benefitted ? You would, on the suppositions now admitted, have produced a book such as in your opinion the Bible ought to have been. But where would such a book find readers ? Give to every man the abilities and the application of a Lord Chancellor, and he may then be able to understand it when he tries. But how will you get him to try ? How will you awaken

his interest ? how will you arrest his attention ? There is only one way open to you. Restore to the Bible that human element of which your chimerical imagination had robbed it. Instead of deterring us by the rigid immobility of the statue, pointing with undeviating finger, and gazing with unsympathising eye, let us be again attracted by the loving voice, the beckoning hand, the wistful glance, that temper the divinity of the message by the humanity of the messenger ; that speak of human emotion and of human passion, of human contrition and of human aspiration, until every fibre of our nature thrills with the stirring consciousness, This message comes to me : for “I myself also am a man !”

We maintain therefore, that if the Bible is to speak naturally, it must of necessity speak figuratively. For the language of nature is the language of figure. It is so among the most highly civilised of earth’s peoples ; and it is so among those rude and savage tribes where civilisation is unknown. In this respect, what Butler says of Sir Hudibras is of universal application,

“ For rhetoric he could not ope
His mouth, but out there flew a trope.”

Nor would this be less true even if there should be many who, with respect to rhetoric, should find themselves in the condition of poor M. Jourdain with respect to prose, when at last he discovered, to his great admiration, that he had talked it for more than forty years without knowing it. Yet what else is it but to speak most tropically when instead of speaking of ships or oxen, we put the part for the whole, and say so many *head* of cattle, or so many *sail* of the line ? when we say (not that *old age*, but) that *grey hairs* should be respected ; or when we turn “a cabinet minister” into “a pillar of the state ?” But more than this. Not merely are these simplest combinations of words stamped with that indelible figurativeness which characterises all language, but we shall find that the same characteristic clings to each word considered separately and alone. “Pontiff” still tells us of the bridge which the first pontifex had to keep in repair ; “calamity” still points backwards to the first calamity (calamus), the loss of standing corn ; in the “dactyl” we perceive the joints of the finger, while the “sycophant” is re-

dolent of figs ; the “ ducat ” suggests the duke who coined it, just as the pound sterling¹ suggests the *sovereign* whose name and effigy it bears ; the “ adage ” has its own practical lesson of something to be done ;² the *ram*-rod (like the battering-*ram*) points to a natural action as old as the creation ; and if the “ *primrose* ” points to *primus*, it has good reason as an *early* flower of spring.

But further. To this class of words, each with its own imagery, but each too with one definite meaning, must be added that other class of words innumerable which, besides their primitive signification, have also an indefinite number of others. Père Bourgeois tells us (—speaking of his Chinese studies, and preparation of his first sermon—) “ They told me *chou* signified a book, so that I thought when ever the word *chou* was pronounced, a book was the subject of discourse ; not at all. Chou, the next time I heard it, I found signified a *tree*. Now I was to recollect that *chou* was a *book* and a *tree* ; but this amounted to nothing. Chou I found also expressed *great heats*. Chou is to *relate*. Chou is the *Aurora*. Chou means to be *accustomed*. Chou expresses the *loss of a wager*. I should never have done were I to enumerate all the meanings of *chou*.” To take an instance nearer home : *Block* (according to Dr. Johnson) signifies a heavy piece of timber ; a mass of matter. *Block* means the wood on which hats are formed. *Block* means the wood on which criminals are beheaded. *Block* is a sea-term for a pulley. *Block* is an obstruction, a stop ; and finally, *block* means a blockhead. Yet in every instance, the transition from the literal to the metaphorical usage is so obvious and natural, that unless we could alter the conditions of thought, and the consequent structure of speech, it must remain unavoidable. Proceeding to apply these considerations to the interpretation of Scripture, we may notice first, the usage of single words and idiomatic expressions ; then the meaning of the words as deter-

¹ This epithet “ sterling ” as a denomination for genuine English money—not to speak of its many metaphorical applications—is derived from the *Easterlings*, i.e. Prussians and Pomeranians, who,

in old time, were artists in fining gold and silver, and taught their art to the Britons.

² *Adagia*, i.e. proverbs, *ad agendum apta*; *apt* for action and use.

mined by the rest of the sentence, or of sentences as determined by the whole scope of the passage ; and lastly, the principles which regulate the interpretation of passages confessedly figurative, e.g., parables and allegories.

I. 1. As the sacred writers wrote to be understood, we must interpret their language as we interpret the language of common life. In order to put the right meaning on their words we must first of all ascertain the sense in which general usage employs them. When we read, for instance, that "Judah is a lion's whelp," "Joseph, a fruitful bough," "Issachar, a strong ass," and "Naphtali, a hind let loose," every one admits that the language is figurative. So, too, when our blessed Lord represents himself as being now "The Door," and now "The Way ;" now "The True Bread," and now "The True Vine." So that they who single out one solitary expression of this sort, and put upon it a forced construction of their own devising, are guilty not merely of imputing absurdity to the Lord himself, but also of the grossest inconsistency in their interpretation of His words. By what possible process of reasoning can it be right to affirm *literally*, "This [bread] is my body," and yet wrong to affirm *literally* "All flesh is grass?"

2. We must proceed from the known to the unknown. The literal must be our guide to the metaphorical, and not the metaphorical to the literal. The figurative declaration, "All flesh has corrupted his way," must be interpreted by the literal declaration, "There is none that doeth good." The allegorical "Behold the Lamb of God !" and the parabolical "Led as a lamb to the slaughter," alike unfold their meaning in that literal declaration, of "Christ our Passover sacrificed for us."

3. A due observance of Hebraisms, and of those idiomatic expressions which abound in all languages, is essential to correct interpretation. Thus, e.g., To love and to hate, is a Hebrew expression for preferring one thing to another. Hence for the literal translation in Luke xiv. 26, "If any man come to me and hate not his father," we have the true meaning in the parallel passage (Matt. x. 37.), "He that loveth father more than me." Similarly (Ge. xxix. 31.) we read that "Leah

was hated ;" whereas the preceding verse tells us explicitly that the hatred amounted to no more than this, that "Jacob loved Rachel more than Leah." The importance of the doctrine involved here may be seen in Ro. ix. 13.³

To signify by the word "son" a remote descendant, is a usage common to nearly all languages. Thus, the priests are called the sons of Levi. Mephibosheth, though he was the son of Jonathan, is called the son of Saul.⁴ The sons of Benjamin are called the sons of Rachel ;⁵ and Zechariah, the grandson of Iddo, is called by one of his contemporaries his son.⁶ "Son" is thus used for any descendant, as "father" is used for any ancestor.⁷

"Brother" (in Hebrew) is used in the same way for any collateral relation. It is thus applied by Abraham to Lot, who was his nephew.⁸ In one instance too, the descendants of a man who married a daughter of Barzillai, are called from the name of their maternal ancestor's father, the children of Barzillai.⁹ In the same way Jair is called the son of Manasseh, because his grandfather had married the daughter of one of the heads of Manasseh.

The observance of these modes of speech will often remove apparent contradictions. Athaliah, for example, is called in 2 Kings viii. 26, the daughter of Omri ; while in v. 18 she is called the daughter of Ahab. She was really Ahab's daughter, and Omri's grand-daughter. Again : Comparing the statement in the First Book of Kings¹⁰ with that in the Second Book of Chronicles¹¹ we have an apparent discrepancy as to the names of the mother of (Abijah or Abijam) the son and successor of Rehoboam. Looking at this latter passage first, there is no reason whatever to conclude that the two writers intended to designate two different individuals. Michaiah is probably nothing else but a different way of writing Maachah. While,

³ Other instances are De. xxi. 15 ; and Jno. xii. 25.

⁴ 2 Sa. xix. 24.

⁵ Gen. xlvi. 22.

⁶ Cf. Ze. i. 1. with Ezra v. 1.

⁷ 1 Ch. i. 17. with Ge. x. 22, 23.

⁸ Ge. xiv. 16. It is similarly appli-

ed to Jacob in Ge. xxix. (12) 15 : and in Jno. vii. 3, Gal. i. 19, the usage is probably the same.

⁹ Ezra ii. 61 and Neh. vii. 63.

¹⁰ ch. xv. 2.

¹¹ ch. xiii. 2.

as we have just seen, it would be merely according to common usage that she should be called the daughter of Uriel in one place, and the daughter of Absalom in another: that usage giving the name of daughter indifferently, to the niece, granddaughter, or great grand-daughter. If, however, this conclusion, highly probable as it is, should be rejected as unsatisfactory, let the other be adopted by which we understand literally that the daughter of Uriel was the immediate maternal parent of Abijah. Still there is no discrepancy. For the very same narrative enables us to demonstrate that the writer in the Book of Kings used the word "mother" in the sense of "grandmother." That mother of Abijah called Maachah, in the second verse of the chapter, is the very same Maachah who in the tenth verse is called the "mother" of Abijah's son; i.e. her own grandson Asa. We thus perceive that both the words in which the discrepancy appears to be conveyed are used with a latitude which deprives the charge of all force. We revert however at the same time to the first interpretation as being unquestionably the true one. Those who seek further proof of its correctness may find it in the fact that it is the very same writer who tells us of Uriel that tells us also—and that too within some twenty verses from the passage in question—that Maachah was the favorite wife of Rehoboam; and that it was in consequence of this preference that Abijah his son, though lacking the right of primogeniture, succeeded his father as king.¹²

¹² The other proper names occurring in this passage serve at once to illustrate the incidental nature of these orthographical differences, and the real identity which underlies them. A comparison of 1 Ki. xv. 2 with 2 Ch. xi. 20 establishes the identity of Abishalom and Absalom. With respect to the name of this King of Judah, Dr. Kennicott observes that it is now expressed in three ways. Here, and in four other places it is אַבִּימָן, Abijam; in two others (2 Ch. xiii. 20, 21) it is אַבִּיהוּ, Abijahu; but in eleven others it is אַבִּיהָ, Abiah.

Abijah or Abia, as it is expressed by St. Matthew (ch. i. 7) **ABIA**. This last is the reading of thirteen of Kennicott's and De Rossi's MSS.; as well as of thirteen respectable editions of the Hebrew Bible. The Syriac is the same. The LXX in the London Polyglott has *Αβιων*, Abihu; but in the Complutensian and Antwerp Polyglotts it has *Αβια* Abiah: while the *Editio Princeps* of the Vulgate, some MSS., and the text in these two Polyglotts, instead of Abiam, have Abia.

The use of the future for the imperative¹³ is well known ; but the result is that it not unfrequently happens that what in the translation appears a bitter imprecation, is in the original Hebrew nothing more than a simple prediction. There are other and kindred usages much less widely known, though by no means less important. One of these is the Hebraism which expresses in an imperative and active form, things which are to be understood permissively and passively. The highly figurative language of Micaiah to Ahab affords one instance of the importance of this observation ;¹⁴ and that of the divine commission to Isaiah affords another.¹⁵ “ Make the heart of this people fat,” is a statement of the fact as to what would be the consequence when God withdrew his restraining grace, and left them to themselves. For thus the LXX renders it—“ For the heart of this people is become gross ; and their ears are dull, and their eyes have they closed ;”—and it is these very words of the LXX. that are quoted as the words of Isaiah by St. Matthew (ch. xiii. 14, 15,) and St. Paul (Ac. xxviii. 26). “ The prophet speaks of the event, the fact as it would actually happen ; not of God’s purpose and act by his ministry. The prophets are in other places said to perform the thing which they only foretell.” Thus Jeremiah is said to be “ set over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build, and to plant.” And Ezekiel says “ When I came to destroy the city ;” that is, as the margin renders it, “ When I came to prophesy that the

¹³ The imprecatory Psalms (LXIX and CIX) will at once recur to the mind of the reader. The awful passage in the first of these (vv. 22—28) is by some commentators read entirely in the future tense, as a prediction, and not as an imprecation. On the other hand however, it must be observed that most of the verbs are in the imperative ; and that the apostles (St. Peter, Ac. i. 20, and St. Paul, Ro. xi. 7, 10) quote from it as an imprecation.

Psalm CIX is similarly quoted

as an imprecation (Ac. i. 16, 22) ; quoted too in the exact words of the LXX which so translates it ; and yet the first verb in the passage is the only one which necessarily requires this construction, being literally rendered (verse 6) “ Set thou ;” whereas all the other verbs are in the future, and may be rendered as prophecies.

¹⁴ 1 Ki. xxii. 22, 23.

¹⁵ Is. vi. 10. Cf. Bp. Lowth on this latter passage with Grotius on Ma. xiii. 15.

city should be destroyed.”¹⁶ The absurd rhapsodies of the Swedenborgians are defended on the ground that the “letter killeth :” whereas by the principle now established that Scripture simply means that “the letter” declares death (not causes it) as the consequence of sin. Just as in Leviticus, for example, the priest is said to cleanse the leper, when he merely declares him to be clean.”¹⁷

4. Of other peculiarities, semi-Hebraisms, we will only refer to two.

First, those which relate to numbers. “Ten,” for example means several, as well as that precise number: e.g. when Jacob says that Laban had changed his wages “ten times ;” or when Nebuchadnezzar found the Hebrew youths “ten times better than all the magicians and astrologers that were in all his realm.”¹⁸ “Forty” means “many.” Persepolis is called in Eastern language, “the city of forty towers ;” though the number was much larger. This is probably the meaning in 2 Ki. viii. 9 ; and possibly even in Eze. xxix. 11, 13. “Seven” and “seventy” are used to express a large and complete, though an uncertain number. Thus, historically, we understand that the seven demons cast out of Mary of Magdala indicate her extreme suffering, if not her great wickedness ; while practically we learn that until there is an end of our brother’s repentance, there is to be no end of our forgiveness. Sometimes (as with ourselves) when exact precision is not required a round number is used although not perfectly accurate. Thus the number of those who were slain by the plague in the matter of Baal-Peor, is given roundly by Moses as “twenty and four thousand.” St. Paul in an incidental mention of it leaves out the odd hundreds and gives it as “three and twenty thousand ;” the exact number being between the two.¹⁹

Second, those which relate to names. Different persons have often the same name, while the same persons have often different names ; and hence arises sometimes a greater amount of confusion than was ever experienced by the authors of “The Rejected Addresses.” Pharaoh, Abimelech, Agag, Benhadad, Ptolemy and Cæsar, were names as far from designating parti-

¹⁶ Je. i. 10. Eze. xlivii. 3.

¹⁷ Ro. v. 20. Le. xiii. 3, 13.

¹⁸ Ge. xxxi. 7. Da. i. 20.

¹⁹ Nu. xxv. 9. 1 Co. x. 8.

cular individuals as Plantagenet, or Tudor, or Stuart, or Orange, or Hapsburg. The Augustus mentioned in Luke ii. 1, was the second of that name. The Cæsar who reigned when Christ was crucified was Tiberius. The Emperor to whom Paul appealed, and who is called both Augustus and Cæsar, was Nero.²⁰ For the purpose of identification we must look for the proper as well as the common name: and the Philistine and Egyptian Kings appear, like the Romans, to have had both. Thus we read of Pharaoh Nechoh and of Pharaoh Hophra; and the Abimelech mentioned in Ps. xxxiv., is called Achish in 1 Sa. xxi. 11. Amaziah was the name, not only of an idolatrous King of Judah, but of an idolatrous priest of Bethel, who brought against Amos a false charge of conspiracy.²¹ There were four Zachariahs, and five Herods. There was Herod the Great, and Herod the Tetrarch, and Philip Herod, and Herod Agrippa. Of this last name there were two: the father, who in Scripture is called Herod only, the murderer of the apostle James, and the subject of that miserable and miraculously sudden death at Cæsarea; and the son, who in Scripture is called Agrippa only; and before whom Paul was brought to Festus. The characters of these two were widely different; and a knowledge of this fact is essential to a clear understanding of the history. The importance of careful recognition in this matter of proper names will further appear when we discover for example, that Ahaziah, the son of Jehoram, is called Azariah and Jehoahaz;²² that Jehoahaz, the son of Josiah, is called Johanan and Shallum;²³ that Jehoiada, the priest, is called Johanan, and probably Barachias;²⁴ while Uzziah is called Azariah, and Nathaniel, Bartholomew. In such instances however, the different names have often the same meaning. In like manner, whether we read of Raguel, or Reuel, of Hobab, or Jethro, we are reading of Moses' father-in-law. Joshua is twice in the New Testament called Jesus.²⁵ The father of David is Nahash, as well as Jesse.²⁶ Levi is the same as Matthew: and Thad-

²⁰ Ac. xxv. 21.

Jer. xxii. 11.

²¹ 2 Ch. xxv. Am. vii. 10, 11.

²⁴ 2 Ch. xxiv. 20: 1 Ch. vi. 9:

²² 2 Ki. viii. 29: 2 Ch. xxii. 6:

Matt. xxiii. 35.

xxi. 17.

²⁵ Ac. vii. 45: He. iv. 8.

²³ 2 Ki. xxiii. 30: 1 Ch. iii. 15:

²⁶ 2 Sa. xvii. 25: 1 Ch. ii. 13, 16.

deus, Lebbeus, and Judas, are all different names for the apostle Jude.

What has now been said of names of persons is equally true of names of places. It would have been surprising indeed had it been otherwise. To have one Antioch in Syria, and another in Phrygia, is as natural as to have a Bradford in Wilts, and another in Yorkshire. Dumbartonshire has its Alexandria, as well as the Delta of the Nile. If the ancient Joppa is on the Mediterranean, the modern is on the Frith of Forth. The law that multiplies the appellation of Ouse or Avon, is the very same that multiplies the appellation of Mizpeh.²⁷ Stockton-on-the-Forest, and Stockton-on-Tees, Barton-upon-Irwell, and Barton-upon-Humber, give a very good account of the two Bethlehems, and the two Cæsareas.

Interesting as in all such instances it is, to trace the operation of those causes which have assigned to different places the same name; it is no less so to trace the operation of those other causes which have assigned to the same places, different names. When Mt. Hermon looked down on a Sidonian colony he received from the newly arrived immigrants a new name. With them, he was henceforth Sirion;²⁸ while by the aboriginal Amorites he was still called Shenir. From its Sidonian associations the new colony was first called Laish. But by right of conquest Laish succumbed to Dan; as Dan afterwards gave place to Paneas, and Paneas, last of all, to Cæsarea Philippi. So that in this single instance, the very same process that gives us La Manche, for The Channel, and substitutes Cologne (i.e. *Colonia Agrippina*) for the ancient Oppidum Ubiorum, gives us three cotemporaneous designations for Mt. Hermon, and four consecutive ones for the small town at its foot. If the modern Abyssinia is sometimes called Ethopia, and sometimes Cush, the difference between these designations is not greater,

²⁷ Ouse = ooze, to flow gently; and Avon being an old British (Cornish) word for a river or stream. Mizpeh means "a watch-tower." Those most prominent in Scripture are the Mizpeh in Mount Gilead; that in Moab

(probably the same as the preceding); Mizpeh of Gibeah; and Mizpeh in the tribe of Judah.

²⁸ And not with them only: David adopts the name in Ps. xxix. 6.

and the reason for it is not less, than that presented by York and Toronto, on the shores of Lake Ontario. The identity of Brightelmstone and Brighton, or Medway's-town and Maidstone, is not plainer than that of Edom and Idumea. The transformation of the Roman Corinium to the English Cirencester, is far more remarkable than that of the Ashdod which worshipped Dagon to the Azotus which welcomed Philip. No one who looked round upon its shores could wonder that the Sea of Galilee should be sometimes called the Sea of Tiberias ; nor could any one fail to see how Gennesareth sprang from Cinnereth. If we sometimes find Horeb and Sinai used without much apparent discrimination, we must remember that though separate peaks they were united in the same mountain range ; just as Ben Lomond and Ben Ledi both belong to the Grampians. And similarly, the barren wastes of Ziph, of Maon, and Engedi, were but parts of the one "wilderness" of Judah.

We may not dismiss this subject of proper names without a general remark on the importance of attending to their meaning. They are always significant : they are often highly illustrative. Why Jacob should call a certain heap of stones "Galeed" (or Gilead), and Laban call it "Jegar-Sahadutha," is inexplicable, until we learn from the margin or elsewhere that both these names were equivalents for "a heap of witness." The celebrity of the ancient Aquae Sextiae may still be traced in the hot springs of the modern Aix ; and Beer-lahai-Roi has for more than thirty centuries attested God's providential care. Orleans speaks not more plainly of its own rebuilding by Aurelian, Saragossa is not more suggestive of Cæsarea Augusta, nor Grenoble (through Gratianopolis) of Gratian, than is Samaria of that Shemer from whom Omri bought the hill on which he built his future capital. It may be interesting, in the monosyllabic Treves, to trace the vestiges of the heptasyllabic Trevirorum Civitas ; or in the conglomerate designation of Stratford-upon-Avon to find the fossil remains of Roman, Saxon and of Celtic times ;²⁹ but how much more so to review the illustrious events whose imperishable record is summed up in the single words, Mahanaim, or Peniel, Jehovah-shalom, or En-hakhore !

²⁹ Roman *Strat*, Teutonic *ford*, British *avon*.

We love to treasure the associations which cluster round old St. Albans. We think with hallowed gladness of the Christian heroism that, in ancient Verulam, braved the fiercest terrors of the Diocletian persecution ; of the happy accession of Constantine ; and the consequent re-establishment of primitive Christianity in Roman Britain, almost three hundred years before the mission of Augustine. But we tread more hallowed ground, and view a more august transaction, invested with a brighter halo, when we read of the fugitive patriarch that “he called the name of that place Bethel ; but the name of that city was Luz at the first.”

II. Proceeding to the second part of our subject, we observe that most words have obviously various senses, each of which is sanctioned by general usage. It thus becomes necessary, in order to ascertain the meaning of a word, to mark the meaning of the other words with which it stands connected in the sentence ; that is to say, we must ascertain the sense in which general usage employs it in its particular connection. And this is our second rule of interpretation.

If any one supposes that this rule is framed specially for the interpretation of Scripture, he may listen with advantage to the words of an eminent philosopher on the general subject :³⁰ —“ When I consult Johnson’s Dictionary, I find many words of which he has enumerated forty, fifty, or even sixty different significations ; and after all the pains he has taken to distinguish them from each other, I am frequently at a loss how to avail myself of his definitions. Yet, when a word of this kind occurs to me in a book, or even when I hear it pronounced in the rapidity of *viva voce* discourse, I at once select, without the slightest effort of conscious thought, the precise meaning it was intended to convey. How is this to be explained but by the light thrown upon the problematical term by the general import of the sentence ? ”

Thus, for example, in a passage already quoted, the word “flesh” signifies all mankind. And in the Psalmist’s declaration, “O Thou that hearest prayer, unto Thee shall all

³⁰ Dugald Stewart.

flesh come ;" the meaning is the same. Similar to this, though not the same with it, is the meaning in such declarations as, "The Word was made flesh ;" "God manifest in the flesh ;" i.e. in human nature. When St. Paul asks the Galatians, "Are ye now made perfect by the flesh ?" the word stands for the ceremonies of the Mosaic law, with a special reference to circumcision. Of those who are under the guidance of their corrupt nature, we read, "They that are in the flesh cannot please God ;" and yet the promised renewal of that nature, the substitution of a tender and teachable for a hard and impenitent heart, is expressed by the use of the very same word—"I will give you a heart of flesh."

Nor is there anything strange in this last instance where, as in many others, the divergence between two different meanings of the same word is so great as to amount almost to opposition. It is a divergence which is found everywhere. Thus, with ourselves, the preposition "for" denotes both "in favor of," and "in opposition to." In the first sense we say, "The gift is for a friend :" in the second "It rains ; but for all that (i.e. in opposition to all that, or notwithstanding all that,) he will ride." But the primary sense,³¹ which is that of *passing* or *moving towards* a place, reconciles both significations. The *moving* or *going towards* a place or thing may either be in friendship or in hostility. Which of the two it is, in any one case, must be determined by the context. It is precisely in this way that the word בָּךְ (Barak) has acquired (according to the most eminent authorities) the opposite meanings of "to bless" and "to curse."³² Originally it meant to "bend the knee ;" and that act was equally appropriate in asking a favor for others, and in denouncing them. Similarly, the same word חֵסֶד (Chesed) signifies piety and impiety, mercy and shame ; and the word which in Is. lxii. 10 signifies "clear the stones away," signifies in almost every other instance "cast the stones upon." So close is the connection between *lapidavit* and

³¹ From *Faran*, to go ; whence *fare* as in "farewell." Thus Milton (Paradise Lost, Bk. iv.),

"So on he fares, and to the border comes
Of Eden."

³² "The most eminent authorities :" for the profound Hebraists among the fifty-four translators of the Authorized Version were a host in themselves. And it is no

elapidavit, and so natural too ; since, whether gathered up, or gathered out, in either case they are “gathered.” “The same Hebrew word signifieth both an *enemy* and an *observer*, because an enemy lieth at catch, and observeth narrowly ; *chastening* and *teaching*, this being the end of that ; *silver* and *money*, because money is usually made of silver ; a *prince* or *nobleman*, and *bountiful*, because he should be so ; *simple* and *perfect*, since that which is simple, is in its kind perfect ; to *repent* and *comfort*, because true comfort belongs only to the *penitent*.” The marginal and textual readings of Job iv. 18 seem at first sight to have very little in common ; yet as Leigh rightly observes, (after quoting ten slightly varied renderings of these two principal meanings,) the diversity of these translations arises from the different significations of the word **הַלֵּל** (Halal).³³

Of course there are not wanting those who magnify this diversity ; who represent it as a peculiarity of biblical language, and an insurmountable obstacle to all certainty of interpretation. Such representations however, are contrary to fact. This diversity of meaning is in no respect a peculiarity of the sacred writers. And so far is it from destroying all certainty of interpretation, that by a common reference to the original idea, it is highly conducive to it. In illustration of these statements take our own word “let,” with its double meaning—its opposite

refutation of the conclusion of such men as Miles Smith and Lively, Chadderton and Reynolds, to charge (as Parkhurst charges) the lexicons with “absurdity,” and contrariety to the ancient versions. Neither he, nor Dr Samuel Lee, who takes the same side (though much more temperately) in his opposition to Gesenius, has refuted the reasons given by those who maintain the correctness of the A. V. in the passages referred to : i.e. 1 Ki. xxi. 10, 13 : Job i. 5, 11 : ii. 5, 9.

“It is most certain,” says Selden, “that the verb *Barak* signifies

to *execrate*, or to *curse*, as well as to bless ; . . . according to the connexion in which it is used.” He adduces as parallel instances the usage of *saceror* and *imprecari* among the Latins : the former signifying either to *consecrate*, or to *curse* ; and the latter, to *wish evil*, or to *wish well*. And then he adds, “So, *Barak* denotes what a man wishes or calls for, with an ardent mind, whether it be salvation or perdition. . . And the difference is to be collected from the nature of the case, and from the context.”

³³ Leigh : *Critica Sacra*.

meanings—of “to allow,” and “to hinder.” Both are explained by a reference to its root “*Let*,” which signifies a *sluice* or vent for water, which, of course, either *allows* or *obstructs* the flowing of the water, according as it is opened or shut. In like manner *heat* and *hate*, though apparently unconnected in their present signification, reflect mutual illustration on each other’s meaning, when discovered to be both derivatives of the same Saxon root *haetan*, to stir or agitate; hate and heat alike involving the idea of violent excitement. In modern German, *schlecht* = “bad.” But at the time of the Minnesänger it meant “good.” “Erenwil niht tuon wan slehtes,” [He (God) will do nothing but good,] occurs in Freidank’s *Bescheidenheit*. The change may be thus traced:—What is good is right and straight; what is straight is simple; but simple, even in English, means foolish; and thus from foolish, through useless, we come to bad.

The consistent application of the natural principles thus established will elucidate very clearly much that would otherwise be obscure. Thus, in the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, “works,” when used alone, denotes the opposite of faith; i.e. the performance of legal duties as the ground of salvation. In the Epistle of James, on the other hand, the expression always means the obedience and holiness which flow from faith. In the one case, works are inconsistent with salvation; in the other, they are essential to it. But it is impossible to explain the one by the other. So in John i. 1, the term “Word” cannot be explained by 2 Ti. iv. 2, where it denotes the gospel. On the national humiliation of the Ninevites it is said that “God repented of the evil that he had said that he would do unto them;” while elsewhere we read that God is “not a man that he should lie; neither the son of man that he should repent.”³⁴ From the first passage we learn that God changes his dealings with sinners when they change; from the second that there is no fickleness or untruthfulness in him. When God is said to make “darkness his secret place,” darkness means inscrutability; when he is said to dwell in light, light means purity, intelligence, splendour. Within the space of a few lines, and in one single paragraph of the inspired history, we read that

³⁴ Nu. xxiii. 19.

God “spake unto Moses face to face;” and yet we also read that no man can see His face and live. In the first passage the expression means to have intercourse without the intervention of another; in the second, to have a full and familiar sight of the Divine glory.

Nor is it only in the case of single words that the principle is applicable. We find not unfrequently entire phrases which though themselves alike, are used in different aspects, in altogether different senses. Thus it is true of John the Baptist that he was, and that he was not, Elias.³⁵ He was the Elijah of prophecy; our Lord himself has put that beyond all question, even if the angel Gabriel had not already done so. And it is equally certain that he was not that Elijah the Tishbite whom the Jews expected. Similarly we read that after the complete subjugation of the enemies of the Messiah, “then cometh the end.” And yet, “He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end.”³⁶ Both statements are true. When the mediatorial work is accomplished the mediatorial reign shall end. But when the King of nations and King of saints shall cease to be Mediator, he shall not cease to be God. And in virtue of that true Divinity by which He could say “He that hath seen me hath seen the Father,” on His vesture and on His thigh the name shall still be written, “King of kings, and Lord of lords!” and He shall reign for ever and ever.

III. The most comprehensive rule of interpretation yet remains to be stated. We must “Compare Scripture with Scripture,” “spiritual things with spiritual.” It is thus alone that we arrive at certainty. “A Scripture truth is really the consistent explanation of all that Scripture teaches in reference to the question examined, and a Scripture duty is the consistent explanation of all the precepts of Scripture on the duty examined.” We must study God’s word as we study his works. We must first examine each fact or phenomenon, and ascertain its meaning; and then, classifying it with other similar facts, attempt to explain the whole.

³⁵ Matt. xi. 14. Jno. i. 21.

instances are Jno. v. 31: viii. 14:

³⁶ Lu. i. 33. 1 Co. xv. 24. Other

and Ac. ix. 7: xxii. 9.

1. Thus, with respect to doctrines. We read that repentance, faith, and obedience, are gifts of God, that it is God that worketh in us to will; and that without Christ we can do nothing. Yet we are prevented from inferring that exhortations to repentance, faith, and obedience are unnecessary; for the Scriptures abound with such exhortations; and the guilt of non-compliance with them is charged entirely and exclusively upon men. "The preparation of the heart in man" is a work of Divine grace³⁷; but it is not the less a work of human obligation. The discharge of this obligation is a positive duty, and the neglect of it a positive sin; because men labour under no other inability than disinclination. It is this that constitutes the secret of all Jehoshaphat's success, as the lack of it is fraught with Rehoboam's failure. "He did evil because he prepared not his heart to seek the Lord."³⁸

2. With respect to the promises of Scripture we cannot do better than adopt the wise canon of our fathers:—"We must receive God's promises in such wise, as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scripture; and in our doings, that Will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us in the Word of God."³⁹ For "the secret will of God, let us be assured, is no contradiction of his revealed will; it is no reserve upon it, tending to frustrate and nullify its purport."⁴⁰ "We cannot dishonour the goodness and veracity of God more than to suppose He mocks men by his promises, and makes a show and offer of a benefit, when he really intends none; for all his ways are faithfulness and truth."⁴¹ For "all the promises of God" in Christ "are yea, and amen;" that is they are absolutely certain on the ground of His merits for whose sake alone they are given and fulfilled.

One important principle established by a comparison of Scripture promises is this: they are to be considered as motives to prayer and exertion. It was after Nathan had said to David "The Lord hath put away thy sin," that the latter poured forth those most earnest supplications of the fifty-first psalm. Does God promise to establish his servant's house and his kingdom

³⁷ Pr. xvi. 1.

³⁸ 2 Ch. xix. 3: xii. 14.

³⁹ Art. xvii.

⁴⁰ Scott.

⁴¹ Tillotson.

for ever? Then that servant straightway takes the promise and pleads it as the ground of the petition, "Do as Thou hast said." The command "Make you a new heart," is not more dependent on the promise, "A new heart will I give you," than is that promise itself on the condition of earnest prayer:—"I will yet for this be enquired of."⁴² When Elijah prays for rain, why is it with that impassioned earnestness that bows his face between his knees? Had he not already received the positive assurance "I will send rain upon the earth?" When Daniel knew that the seventy years' captivity was nearly expired, what need for those urgent supplications which were rewarded by the mission of Gabriel himself? When the special gift of the Holy Ghost had been absolutely and irrevocably promised to the apostles, what need of their patient and protracted prayer in the hallowed upper room? There can be but one answer. This marked uniformity of conduct under so wide a diversity of circumstances proves conclusively that God's promises, rightly regarded, are the strongest incentives to our own exertions. When the great apostle of the Gentiles was a prisoner in the tower of Antonia, his enemies, more bitterly determined than ever, were plotting against his life. His confidence in the Divine protection had just been reassured by a special promise. Yet notwithstanding this promise, he used all the means in his power to baffle the conspiracy which aimed at his assassination. On his subsequent voyage, it was after he had assured the crew of their safety, guaranteed by the Divine promise, that he insisted on a condition not previously specified, and without which he declared that safety was impossible: "Except these abide in the ship ye cannot be saved." He knew that in the fulfilment of God's promises, the means are ordained to the end.

Another important principle is the general applicability of promises made originally to particular individuals. Israel's great military leader, Moses' successor, was no ordinary man, nor was his greatness achieved under ordinary circumstances. Yet it is one of the special promises given for the encouragement of Joshua that St Paul quotes as applicable to Christians at large.⁴³ This is of the highest importance as establishing the

⁴² Eze. xviii. 31: xxxvi. 26: xxxvi. 37. ⁴³ He. xiii. 5, cf. with Jo. i. 5.

fact that God's promises are made to character. He is no respecter of persons. Any man may participate in Abraham's blessedness who will walk in the steps of Abraham's faith. "I will make all my goodness pass before thee," was not a more sure word of promise to Moses, three thousand years ago, than it is to-day to all who, like him, walk with God. It is indeed a great thing to be like Daniel, "a man greatly beloved;" or, like Samuel, to be eminent "among them that call upon His name;" but the promises of Scripture, "exceeding great and precious" as they are, are all intended to stimulate us in pursuit of that holiness which will invest us with like distinction, having delivered us from the corruption that abounds in the world. The highest distinction of all, is open to all alike: "For whosoever shall do the will of My Father which is in heaven, the same is My brother, and sister, and mother!"

3. The threatenings of Scripture—like the promises as instanced above—though given absolutely as to the form of expression, were given conditionally as to the fact.

Thus, God said to Israel, "I will deliver you no more." Yet He did deliver them—in accordance with a principle already established. "Ahab was threatened that during his lifetime all his posterity should be destroyed; and again, that dogs should lick his blood where they had licked the blood of Naboth; but though no condition was expressed yet this sentence was altered; for neither of these threatenings was fully executed. "Yet forty days and Nineveh shall be destroyed;" but it stood for more than eighty years after Jonah's proclamation. Just as Hezekiah lived fifteen years after the word had gone forth, "Set thy house in order, for thou shalt die, and not live."

Indeed the Scriptures themselves furnish the general rule for the interpretation of the Divine threatenings. "At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation . . . to destroy it, if that nation turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them."⁴⁴ And the rule for individuals is the same:—"When I say unto the wicked, Thou shalt surely die; if he turn from his sin, and do that which is lawful and right

⁴⁴ Ju. x. 14, 16: See also Nu. xiv. 12, 20.

⁴⁵ Jer. xviii. 7, 8. Eze. xxxiii. 14.

... he shall surely live, he shall not die." From which, as Bishop Sanderson remarks, it is clear that God's threatenings have ever a condition annexed to them in God's purpose, whether that condition be expressed or not.

4. Speaking generally however, the illustrations of the importance of this principle are too numerous and too various for classification. They abound in every page. The neglect of this principle is the most fruitful source of error, while its observance is the surest guide to truth. "We have heard out of the law," said the Jews of old, "that Christ abideth for ever: and how sayest Thou that the Son of man must be lifted up?" Had they only compared Scripture with Scripture they would have abandoned their objection. That the Son of man should be lifted up and cut off, though not for himself, had been foretold as clearly as that everlasting duration of His kingdom on which alone they chose to fix their regard. Never was rebuke more significant than that which was aimed at the practice of propounding, as if derived from Scripture, doctrines not based upon the concurrent sense of different passages, as elicited by mutual comparison: "SEARCH the Scriptures."

IV. It is this same principle of mutual comparison, of connecting the text with the context, of distinguishing the more prominent features, and observing the general scope of a passage, that is chiefly valuable in the interpretation of parables and allegories. Any interpretation of a parable or allegory inconsistent with the great truth which when thus examined, it is seen to involve, must be rejected.

1. For instance: the parable of the good Samaritan was obviously intended to illustrate the second great commandment; "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." Yet it has sometimes been gravely maintained that the good Samaritan represents our Blessed Lord; the wounded traveller, our sinful race; the priest and Levite, the moral and ceremonial law; the oil and wine, pardon and sanctification; the two-pence, the two ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper; the inn, the church, and the landlord, a pious minister of the Gospel; a fanciful interpretation entirely inconsistent with our Saviour's design. Again: in the parable of the prodigal son, it needs no demon-

stration to convince us that the great truth there embodied is, the cordial welcome, the yearning affection with which God receives the vilest of his children when they return to him. But to teach, as some have done, that the ring is the everlasting love of God, or the seal of the spirit ; that the sinner is called the younger son, because man as a sinner is younger than man as righteous ; that the citizen to whom he went was a legal preacher ; that the swine were self-righteous persons ; that the husks were works of righteousness ; that the fatted calf was Christ ; that the shoes were means of upright conversation, the doctrines and precepts of Scripture ; that the music which the elder brother heard was the preaching of the Gospel : this is to call off our attention from the great lesson of the parable, to doctrines which the disciples could not have found in the parable itself. “ By turning the most delicate touches into important Scriptural truths, the great design of the whole is obscured, and we learn to bring a meaning *into* the passage, and not *out of* it ; a habit which we are likely to employ with more serious mischief in other places.”

Indeed, as Archbishop Tillotson has remarked, so far are the parable and its moral from resembling two planes that touch each other in every point, that they are sometimes rather like a globe laid upon a plane, which touches it in one point only. When our Lord says “ Behold I come as a thief,” He does not mean stealthily or fraudulently : the resemblance is restricted to the single point of unexpected suddenness. If this had been duly observed, Jerome would have ceased to regard the parable of the unjust steward as “ very obscure ; ” and Celsus and Julian could no longer have pretended to condemn our Lord for the commendation bestowed upon the unjust steward. For the single point to be illustrated by the parable was the means used for the attainment of an end. The character of the steward is sufficiently indicated by the epithet “ unjust ; ” but his conduct in the choice of his means showed a forethought well calculated to secure his end. And in this single point of comparison the children of this world are, in their generation, wiser than the children of light ; that is, they better adapt their means to their end.

2. But while minor explanations must be admitted only so far as they subserve and consist with the general design, they are not to be systematically overlooked. In the parables of the sower and of the tares, for example, which our Lord himself interpreted, the moral application descends to the minutest particulars of the narrative; the birds, the thorns, the stony ground, have all their meaning; and indeed it may be said generally that the similitude is perfect in proportion as it is on all sides rich in applications. Even in these parables, however, not all the circumstances are explained. "While men slept," (in the parable of the tares) and the phrase "I cannot dig, to beg I am ashamed," (in that of the unjust steward) have neither of them any application in the explanation which our Lord himself gave. So in the largest allegory in Scripture—the book of Canticles—the description given of the bride is probably no more than an expression of the love and complacency of Jehovah towards his chosen.

3. Parables, allegories, types, however useful they may be for illustration or confirmation of doctrines otherwise and previously established, are yet in no respect to be regarded either as the primary or exclusive source from which the doctrines of Scripture may be derived. "Theologia parabolica non est argumentativa." There is no knot parabolical that may not be untied by the "great plainness of speech" which we find elsewhere.⁴⁶ To suppose, as did the old Pelagians, from the parables of the faithful servant and the prodigal son, that God pardons us without sacrifice or intercession, simply on the ground of our repentance or our prayers, is to reject the whole tenor of the Bible. To conclude, from the parable of the ten virgins, that because five were wise and five were foolish, half of those who make a profession of religion will finally be saved, while half finally perish,⁴⁷ would be to contradict the inference from that of the lost piece of silver, where the proportion instead of being five to five is nine to one; or that of the lost sheep, where the number of those who went astray is represented as only one in a hundred.

⁴⁶ Manifestè dicta absolvant parabolas. Irenœus ii. 47.

⁴⁷ Jno. viii. 24: He. x. 39.

4. The typology of Scripture is distinguished by a peculiarity which calls for separate remark. There can be no difficulty in distinguishing between figurative and literal language ; but there is considerable room for variety of opinion in denoting typical persons and things. From the illustrations which St. Paul has furnished of the typical nature of the patriarchal and Mosaic dispensations,⁴⁸ we have reason to think that there are many more types in the Old Testament than are distinctly referred to, as such, in the New. Sodom and Ishmael, Egypt and Babylon, as well as Israel, with the whole Levitical ceremonial, were all typical. The whole dispensation was the shadow of good things to come ; not the very substance of them. Jewish history and worship form one grand type. An eminent modern writer finds “ the Gospel in Ezekiel.” Others had found it long before, in Leviticus. The Old Testament (as Augustine has it) is the New, veiled ; and the New Testament is the Old, unveiled. Some go so far as to maintain that the whole of the Jewish economy is affirmed in the New Testament to be typical.⁴⁹ Others maintain that nothing is to be regarded as a type in the Old Testament that is not formally recognised as such in the New.⁵⁰ Archbishop Secker, for instance, would have us receive the sacrifice of Isaac as a type, on account of the resemblance which it has to that of Christ. And it must be admitted that few, if any, of the acknowledged types are more full of points of striking resemblance. But, in Bishop Marsh’s view, something more is necessary than mere resemblance. To constitute one thing the type of another, the former must not only resemble the latter, but it must have been designed to resemble it in its original constitution. And this is undoubtedly a safe principle of interpretation. If Justin had adopted it, he would not have taught that the wrestling and lameness of Jacob were respectively typical of the temptation and death of Christ. If Cyril had adopted it, he would not have called Malchus a type of the Jews, nor imagined that as his right ear was cut off by Peter, so they were to be

⁴⁸ He. viii. 5 : ix. 9 : x. i: Gal. iv. 22—31.

ture (2nd Series).

⁴⁹ Fairbairn : *Typology of Script-*

⁵⁰ Bp. Marsh : *Lectures on Bib. Crit. and Interpretation.*

deprived of their right hearing, their hearing being only sinister or disobedient. There is another consideration too, which highly enhances the value of this restricted definition. Types properly so called are prophetic, and may be used to prove, as well as to illustrate, the gospel. Examples, analogies, and resemblances, not announced as typical, are illustrative only. They explain truth rather than prove it.

But even in the most perfect types not every circumstance is typical. The high-priest on the great day of atonement, was eminently a type of Christ ; yet the circumstance of his offering first for his own sin has no counterpart in the One offering of our High Priest, for in Him was no sin. David, in the place of his birth, in his distinction as the man after God's own heart, in his family descent, in his kingly character, in his peculiar sorrows, in the "everlasting covenant ordered in all things and sure," was an eminent type of Christ ; but not David in his sins.

5. The application of these principles is the more important on account of the habitual perversion of Scripture under cover of a pretended allegorical interpretation. The ancient Rabbis led the way by allegorizing on the *words* of Scripture. The letter **שׁ** occurs six times in the first verse of the Bible ; and as **שׁ** represents 1000, they supposed that the existence of the world for six thousand years is the truth included in this fact. In the same spirit the pseudo-Barnabas says that Abraham circumcised three hundred and eighteen men of his house, because this number, in Greek letters, represents Jesus and the cross.⁵¹ On the other hand, some writers, both ancient and modern, allegorize Scripture by destroying its *facts*. Thus, John the Baptist is said to have had no real existence, but to be only a mythic representation of the collective body of the Jewish prophets in their relation to Christ. Of this class were Hymeneus and Philetus in apostolic times, and Bunsen's apologists in our own ; "saying that the resurrection is past already ;" that is spiritualizing the plain declarations of the Bible as to matters of fact, and declaring that such passages are not to be taken in their simple, natural, and grammatical

⁵¹ Ge. xiv. 14. I = 10, H = 8, and T = 300.

sense, but as intending only a spiritual resurrection from ignorance and error.

Still more frequent, and scarcely less mischievous is the practice, common to all ages, of admitting the historical truth of the inspired narrative, and basing upon every part of it some spiritual doctrine, not merely as illustrated, but as proved and intended by the Holy Spirit. "All that divideth the hoof and cheweth the cud, ye shall eat," said Moses: indicating, says the Epistle of Barnabas, that we should hold fast to those who meditate on the command, (for this is chewing the cud,) and who live in this world but have their expectation in another (for this is dividing the hoof). Heaven and earth, in the Lord's Prayer, says Tertullian, refer to the body and soul of man. The five loaves with which our Lord fed the multitude represent, says Clement, the five senses. Cyril regards them as the five books of Moses, and the two fishes, as the Grecian philosophy, which is generated and carried through heathen waters: or they may mean our Lord's teaching, as apostolic and evangelical. Hilary thinks that the fowls of the air⁵² were unclean spirits, to whom God gives life without trouble. The lilies are the angels: the grass, the heathen. The mother of Zebedee's children represents the law: her children, the believing Jews. Even Athanasius, who sometimes condemned this style of interpretation, expounds Matt. v. 29 by supposing the body to mean the Church, the eyes and hands the bishops and deacons, who ought to be cut off if they commit acts hurtful to the church. These interpretations, however fanciful, were all justified on principle. The obvious historic sense of a passage was always regarded as the less important, sometimes even as altogether untrue; while the spiritual or allegorical was alone deemed worthy of an enlightened mind. Hence Origen, that "everlasting allegorizer," maintains that the history of the creation, of Lot's incest, of Abraham's two wives, of Jacob's marriage with Leah and Rachel, is all an allegory: so readily do extremes beget each other.⁵³

⁵² Ma. vi. 26-30.

⁵³ Let one example stand for all. The Hebrew word "Keturah" means "sweet odour;" and "sweet

odour" is specially applicable to those whose character is fragrant with righteousness: therefore, says Origen, when you read that

These examples have been widely copied and closely imitated by men neither ignorant nor ill-informed. Even the learned and pious Lampe, whose Commentary on St. John is justly described as one of the most valuable ever published, endeavours in this way to interpret the narrative of the miracle at the marriage in Cana. By the bridegroom is meant the governors of the Jewish church ; the bride is the Jewish church itself ; the marriage is the Christian dispensation ; the failing of the wine, the departure of the Spirit of God from the Jewish church, which had begun to depart from the purity of the Law ; the mother of our Lord is the heavenly Jerusalem, bringing into the liberty of the Gospel the children of the Jewish church ; but she is reproved for impatience not knowing the times and seasons, or the hour which had not yet come ; the water being changed into wine represents prophecy and the Law being changed into the Gospel : with much more of the same kind. From a comparison of Acts x. 13, "Rise, Peter, kill and eat ;" with Jno. xxi. 16, "Feed my sheep ;" Cardinal Bellarmine attempts to prove that the duty of the Pope as the successor of Peter, is to put heretics to death.⁴⁴ Whether he ought also to "eat" those whom he hath killed, deponent saith not. And this is Bellarmine, one of the most learned and upright of his order, whom Pope Sextus V. condemned for not going far enough in the assertion of the Papal power ! The truth is that to admit this principle, or rather this negation of all principle, under the guise of allegorical interpretation, is to open wide the door for the entrance of the most monstrous and fatal errors ; while the literal and historic sense, with all the moral and spiritual lessons it conveys, is thrust aside as hateful to the sight, and unworthy of a moment's notice.

V. He however who seeks certainty for his mind and "rest for his soul" will "ask for the old paths," "the good way ;" and walk therein. They will be found in the principles above

Abraham married Keturah in his old age, you are to understand that in his old age Abraham became eminently holy.

⁴⁴ Had he forgotten the canon of

the chief of the schoolmen ;— "Sensus literalis est, quem auctor intendit ?" (Aquinus: Summa Theologiae. Pars I. Qu. I. Art. 10.)

enumerated. Mosheim, speaking of Scripture interpretation in the first century, says, "Those who performed the office of interpreters, studied above all things plainness and perspicuity." Melancthon says, "It is necessary in the Church diligently to investigate and adhere to the simple, natural, grammatical sense of Scripture. We are to listen to the Divine word, not to corrupt it. We must not play tricks with it, by fanciful interpretations. . . The plain natural sense of Scripture always carries with it the richest and most valuable instruction." Luther says, "The literal meaning of Scripture is the whole foundation of faith, the only thing that stands its ground in distress and temptation." And of all the sayings of the judicious Hooker, none is more judicious than his utterance on this subject:—"I hold it for a most infallible rule in exposition of Sacred Scripture, that where a literal construction will stand, the furthest from the letter is commonly the worst."⁵⁵

Nor must it be forgotten that all the great doctrines of the Gospel are stated in language equally simple and decisive. The existence, the perfections, the providence of God; the Personality, yet the Unity, of the sacred Trinity; human depravity and human responsibility; redemption through the atonement of Christ; renewal through the influence of the Holy Ghost; Divine Grace, not more sovereign than free; and heavenly glory as the unfading crown of that grace, for all those who by patient continuance in well doing seek the immortal honours of an endless life: if language have any meaning at all, these doctrines are taught in innumerable passages of the Bible, and in terms incapable of mistake.

The crowning characteristic however of "the old paths," "the good way," still remains to be mentioned. "The interpretation of Scripture requires 'a vision and a faculty divine,' or at least a moral and religious interest which is not needed in the study of a Greek poet or philosopher." "The purer the light in the human heart, the more it will have an expression of itself in the mind of Christ; the greater the knowledge of the development of man, the truer will be the insight gained into the 'increasing purpose' of revelation."⁵⁶ Coming from Mr Jowett, this testi-

⁵⁵ *Eccles. Pol.* b. v., c. lxix.

⁵⁶ *Essays and Reviews*, pp. 337, 375.

mony is significant. Yet a higher authority still has declared that true Christians possess “ an unction of the Holy One,” which incomparably surpasses all merely human teaching.⁵⁷ And the Divine Teacher, addressing nominal Christians, says, “ I counsel thee to . . . anoint thine eyes with eye salve, that thou mayst see.” No physical, no moral law, is more certain, more undeviating, more inflexible in its operation than this:—“ None of the wicked shall understand.”⁵⁸ “ The *secret* of the Lord is with them that fear Him.” “ The meek will He guide in judgment; and the meek will He teach His way.” “ The scorner seeketh wisdom and findeth it not,” for he is wise in his own conceit; and when a man is wise in his own conceit, “ there is more hope of a fool than of him.” But let a man acknowledge his lack of wisdom; let him ask of God who giveth liberally unto all; let him pursue his studies in the docile spirit of the psalmist, crying “ Open Thou mine eyes; that I may behold wondrous things out of Thy law!” “ Shew me Thy ways, O Lord, and teach me Thy paths; lead me in Thy truth and teach me:” and he shall find that the Scriptures are perfectly able to make him wise unto salvation; the engrafted word, received with meekness, is able to save his soul. He shall KNOW in whom he has believed; as well as the CERTAINTY of the things wherein he has been instructed. By the reverential study of the Scriptures alone, “ without any other commentary or exposition, than what the different parts of the sacred volume mutually furnish for each other,” his faith shall stand, not in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God. “ Let the most illiterate Christian study them in this manner, and let him never cease to pray for the illumination of that Spirit by whom these books were dictated, and the whole compass of abstruse philosophy and recondite history shall furnish no argument with which the perverse will of man shall be able to shake this learned Christian’s faith.”⁵⁹

⁵⁷ 1 Jno. ii. 20, 27. ⁵⁸ Da. xii. 10. ⁵⁹ Bp. Horsley: Nine Sermons.

CHAPTER VI.

INSPIRATION.

“Every sentence of the Bible is from God: and every man is interested in the meaning of it.”—LOCKE.

IN examining the Books of Holy Scripture with regard to their contents, we have now reviewed the proofs of their integrity, and enunciated the chief of those settled principles of interpretation by which their meaning is to be ascertained. An important question still remains. In what sense are we warranted in affirming that those Books are Inspired?

The answer to this question is of the highest importance. Diverse and false interpretations are the fruitful source of diverse and false doctrines; but take away the old fashioned doctrine of Inspiration, and the only doctrine that remains is this: that there remains no doctrine at all. This is the dreary deserted goal to which, in spite of ourselves, we are hurried by those who do not scruple to lay hands on the ark of God itself, and then attempt to justify their daring violence by a boast of “free handling.” This “free handling” is sometimes seen in the achievements of Dr. Williams’s “verifying faculty,” (by which nothing is verified,) and sometimes in the exploits of Dr. Colenso’s falsifying faculty (by which it appears that nothing can be verified). But more dangerous by far than these undisguised attacks are those processes of sapping and mining by which, in stealthy simulation, the true direction and treacherous progress of the foes of our faith are covertly concealed. The explicit declaration that “in times past” God did most certainly speak “unto the fathers,” supported as that declaration is by the other, that “holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost” and “not by their own will,” does seem

to an unsophisticated reader to teach pretty plainly the doctrine of Plenary Inspiration. But no: our moderns will teach him (and that with an eloquence so fascinating as to be all but persuasive) that that doctrine is all a mistake; the relic of a now-exploded superstition. He may believe—and if he would escape the denunciations of his teachers he must believe—with Mr. Goodwin,¹ that the Mosaic cosmogony was merely the guess-work of an “early speculator” harassed by no scruples, “and asserting as facts what he knew only as probabilities;” with Dr. Williams,² that the lives of the first patriarchs are to be “relegated to the domain of legend or symbolical cycle,” and that the book of Jonah “contains a late legend, founded on misconception;” or, with Mr. Wilson, that “the story of a serpent tempter, of an ass speaking with man’s voice, of an arresting of the earth’s motion, of waters standing in a solid heap,” may all be accepted as “poetry, or legend:”³ for (O sapient observation!) it was not to the poets, geographers, and historians, that God spake, but only “to the prophets.” The fact that these prophets were themselves the poets, geographers, and historians whom it is attempted thus to silence, is of course a circumstance too trivial and insignificant (not to say too inconvenient), to be allowed to interfere with the settled purpose of this “free handling.”

Never mind: let that pass. Suppose it possible to effect a separation of the prophetic utterances of these “holy men of old” from the historic or topographic statements with which they are inseparably associated: what then? May we then accept those prophetic utterances as divine? By no means. It is true that the prophets—or at least some of them—were inspired; but so were Bezaleel and Aholiab, Shakspeare and Molière. In fact, it is hard to say who is not inspired: for “Inspiration, like God’s omnipresence, is not limited to the few writers claimed by the Jews, Christians, or Mahometans, but is co-extensive with the race. . . . It is wide as the world, and common as God.”⁴ (So then, God did speak to the “poets, geographers, and historians,” after all!) You therefore, good

¹ Essays and Reviews, p. 252. ² Ibid., pp. 57, 77. ³ Ibid., p. 177.

⁴ Theodore Parker: Discourses, pp. 161, 171.

reader, may judge of the inspiration of the prophets from your own. For “the sacred writers acknowledge themselves men of like passions with ourselves, and we are promised illumination from the Spirit which dwelt in them.”⁵ The gentleman who tells you this has furnished you with an example. He finds St. Paul quoting the second Psalm in his epistle to the Hebrews,⁶ and he tells you, in effect, that he, the vicar of Broad Chalke, knows better what is the Hebrew idiom than does the scholar of Gamaliel, the Jew of Tarsus. He finds Philip the Evangelist, under the special influence of the Holy Ghost applying Isaiah’s prophecy⁷ to Christ; but that is nothing to one who is every whit as much inspired as Philip was, (more so indeed, or how could he correct him?) and therefore he boldly pronounces that if that prophecy should be applied to “any single person,” “Jeremiah should be the one!”⁸ See now what it is to be an adept at “free handling.” Nor is it the learned alone who, being thus “inspired,” are permitted to be thus profane. It is “a matter of duty” “if possible, to discriminate the authoritative from the unauthoritative in Scripture;”⁹ and “those who are able to do so, ought to lead the less educated to distinguish between the different kinds of words which it contains; between the dark patches of human passion and error which form a partial crust upon it, and the bright centre of spiritual truth within.”¹⁰

“Dark patches of human passion and error” are to be “distinguished:”—by whom? By “those who are able to do so!” A safe answer, certainly. “The unauthoritative in Scripture” is to be “discriminated” “if possible.” But after the utter failure of the attempt as made by Mr. Newman himself, we are shut up to the inevitable conclusion that it is not possible. What course then remains for us? When the learned leaders lose their way, who shall direct the “less educated” crowd, deluded and misled? For a moment indeed it seems as if light sprang up in the darkness. Amid so many dreary negations there is one little bit of positivism: one little

⁵ Essays and Reviews, p. 78.

⁶ Ch. i. v. 5.

⁷ Ch. liii.

⁸ Essays and Reviews, p. 73.

⁹ F. W. Newman: *Phases of Faith*, p. 121.

¹⁰ Essays and Reviews, p. 177.

spot of firm ground somewhere in the quagmire. Under all the “dark patches” there is a “bright centre.” There is at least one authoritative element among so many of an opposite kind. Let us find it out. Alas! when we make the attempt we learn how vain it is. The more we search, the more hopeless does the search become. All that we can find is, that the authoritative element is not to be found. The bright centre flits before us like an *ignis fatuus*; appears, and disappears, and re-appears, now there, now here—no; not here yet, but somewhere; not far off however, not out of sight, for all our guides have seen it (—so they say); but no two of them tell the same story about it. The highly gifted author of the *Lectures on the Jewish Church* tells us it is in “the prophets;” and in one of its “phases” Mr. Newman thought so too; but he quickly changed his mind. A friend of his told him it was in the fourth Gospel; and the bewildered seeker, who had lost all trace of it among the most remarkable of the prophets, looked eagerly into the fourth Gospel, and saw it too. Not for long, however; he soon found out that “John had made both the Baptist and Jesus speak as John himself would have spoken,” and that “we cannot trust the historic reality of the discourses in the fourth Gospel.” Thus, says he, “Thus was I flung back to the three first gospels, as on the whole, more faithful as a picture of the true Jesus than that which is exhibited in John.”¹¹ Thus faded the light from the pages of the beloved disciple. No wonder after this that it quickly faded from all the rest, and left the poor benighted wanderer, with dimmed and darkened vision, vainly endeavouring to elicit some spark from his own conflicting intuitions, and loudly affirming that all “book revelation” is impossible.

To escape this miserable conclusion, we must have recourse to the “old paths.” There the direction is unmistakeably distinct and plain, and he that runs may read. “ALL Scripture is given by inspiration of God;” and “If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God.”

Many theories of inspiration have been started, but they may all be resolved (with some trifling modifications) into one or other of these four:—

¹¹ *Phases of Faith*: pp. 173, 176.

I. That whatever sort of inspiration was possessed by the writers of the Bible, it was not peculiar to themselves. "Minos and Moses, David and Pindar, Leibnitz and Paul, receive into their various forms the one Spirit from God most high. This inspiration is limited to no sect, age, or nation."¹²

This is the theory of that class of writers whose vagaries we have just been considering. It calls for no further remark here, since it must be at once discarded by all who make a distinction between reason and revelation. But its advocates are fond of asserting that those who reject it must hold its opposite, viz. :—

II. That the human writers of the Bible were mere machines, and had no more to do with what was written than the pen with which they wrote.¹³

Thus, e.g., Dr Williams, after claiming for his own writings as much authority as is conceded to prophets and apostles,—on the ground that if they are inspired, so is he ; and if he is fallible, so are they ;—describes those who demur to this claim as "thinking the sacred writers passionless machines, and calling Luther and Milton 'uninspired.'"¹⁴ But this theory, Dr Williams may perhaps be glad to learn, is rejected by his opponents as being little less untenable than his own (though not a thousandth part so fatal). And that too on good ground. If the human writers were merely passive instruments in the hand of the Holy Spirit, how is it that we can trace so clearly in the language of each, his own distinguishing characteristics ? How is it that each writer uses exactly that style which our knowledge of his antecedents would lead us to expect ? Yet so it is. Isaiah writes like a courtier ; Amos, like a herdsman ; and Ezekiel, the Hebrew *Æschylus*, in a style different from both. Micah is nervously concise, and Nahum is sublimely bold. The Rabbinical lore, the classics, the poetry, poured out with the Tarsic eloquence of Paul, procured for him, naturally enough,

¹² Parker's Discourse, p. 171.
Thus, too, Schleiermacher (der Christliche Glaube, band 1. 3. 115) and De Wette (Lehrbuch Anmerk.) allow the Sacred Writers no more inspiration than Cicero accorded to the poets :—afflatum

spiritus divini.

¹³ This is an exaggerated statement of the theory of verbal dictation held by Calamy, Haldane, and others.

¹⁴ Essays and Reviews, p. 78.

the imputation of “much learning;” while those who heard the powerful appeals of Peter and John, could yet not fail to recognise in their unadorned simplicity of speech and Galilean provincialisms, the marks of “unlearned and ignorant men.” It was through human speech, and in accordance with the laws of man’s nature, that He who spake as never man spake, uttered the lessons of heavenly wisdom. And similarly, it is through human instrumentality, and often through the peculiarities of individual character, that God has spoken in His Word. We perceive in the sacred volume the distinct individuality of the different writers, and discern at the same time the wonderful wisdom of God. It is at once human and Divine.

III. A third theory may be stated thus:—That the writers of the Bible were specially and divinely inspired, when treating on matters of faith and practice, religion and morals; but that in other matters (e.g., history, science, &c.) they were left to themselves, and were thus as liable to errors and inaccuracies as other authors.

This theory, as it is eminently the refuge of **DOUBT**, is the one with which we are here specially concerned. When one hears not only that the Bible contains statements on scientific subjects which are demonstrably false, but that eminent scholars and ecclesiastical dignitaries are among those who impute these false statements to **Holy Scripture**; it is no wonder if, among those who are unable to refute the assertion on its own ground, there should be some who feel compelled to bow to that which carries with it such a parade of authority. But these very persons cannot close their eyes to the moral influence of the Bible, and to those vast results which that influence has effected wherever it has been allowed to operate. Confronting these results, it is impossible to believe that the Bible is a merely human production. On the other hand, confronted by the dogmatic assertions of a “philosophy falsely so called,” it is impossible to attribute scientific error to the God of all truth. Hence this compromise between the two opposite subjects of disbelief. It is their best refuge from doubt. What relates to morals is of God: what relates to inferior subjects is of man. We answer

The distinction here drawn is impossible; and even were it otherwise, it would be useless.

"As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." Here the first clause is the teaching of history; the second, that of theology. But the two are not only bound together in indissoluble association; they are so bound that the theology depends upon the history: i.e. (according to this theory) the credit of the inspired rests upon the credibility of the uninspired. So that when Baron Bunsen's philology or Professor Huxley's ethnology has overturned the belief in the historic Adam, it has by the same act overthrown the faith in the resurrection. No: he who would preserve the citadel "In Christ shall all be made alive," must preserve the outwork "In Adam all die." What God hath joined let no man put asunder.

But again: this discrimination between religious and other truth, if possible for any,¹⁵ would still be impossible for the many, besides being practically useless for all. It takes "The People's Book" out of the hands of the unlearned many who are unable to sever the gold from the dross (so called), and relegates it to the learned few whose incessant and mutual contradictions destroy it altogether as a Rule. Revelation, then, instead of supplementing Reason, is subordinated to it. But this reason is not "pure reason." It is corrupted and depraved. It declines under the influence of a perverted will; and yields to the bias of a prejudiced inclination. What it dislikes it discards; and rejects whatever it is disinclined to receive.

¹⁵ Among the remarkable instances which go to prove that it is not possible for any, Mr. Newman himself records one which is the more worthy of notice as coming from our adversaries. At the time when that gentleman had commenced his career of negations, by adopting the concessions of this theory, he was favored with the friendship of a clergyman whom he himself describes as of apostolic zeal and piety, one who "in labors more abundant," had spent a fortune and spent himself as he "went about doing good." Conversing with this modern apostle

one day, and urging as a matter beyond all dispute that the Bible evidently contained a good deal that was not necessary to "instruction in righteousness," he was asked to name some passage of this sort. He at once instanced 2 Ti. iv. 13., "The cloak that I left at Troas with Carpus, when thou comest bring with thee, and the books, but especially the parchments." To his great surprise his friend replied, "That verse, at any rate, could not be dispensed with; it was that very verse that saved me from selling my library."

IV. The true theory remains : That while the writers were allowed to pursue their own method and use their own powers, the Holy Spirit directed and controlled all that was written, so as to make the writings infallible.

We pronounce this the true theory of the Inspiration of Holy Scripture, on the ground that it alone is consistent with all the facts of the case. The objections to it may be summed up in these three :—

First : That it is not supported by Scripture itself ; that The Book contains nothing which can warrant this imputation of infallibility and consequent authority to the Writers.

We reply : The objection is untrue in point of fact. It consists of a false allegation. It is directly contradicted by such passages as these :—“ ALL Scripture is given by inspiration of God ; ” “ Holy men spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost ; ” “ Ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth the word of God.” The Scriptures are the depository of Truth ; and ignorance of Scripture is the source of Error ; for “ Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures :” and a declaration more authoritative than this it is impossible for man to receive.

Second : It is alleged that Scripture and Science are at variance ; and thence it is inferred that Scripture is wrong.

We answer that with true science the Scripture is not at variance ; and that the “ dogmatic assertions ” to the contrary are assertions without proof. We fully admit that the manner of expression adopted by the writers of Scripture, when alluding to scientific subjects is not marked by scientific accuracy ; but then we maintain (on the ground of undeniable fact) that this mode of expression is not merely justifiable, but that any other mode would be unjustifiable and absurd. An inspired record is designed to benefit and instruct mankind. It must therefore be intelligible. But strictly philosophical language could not be understood in an ignorant age. Every year brings forth fresh discoveries which make it increasingly certain that even now, the wisest men are not sufficiently advanced in knowledge to comprehend a revelation enunciated in exact accordance with the true system of nature. We have already¹⁶ seen how, in

¹⁶ The Anthropomorphism of Scripture: ante, p. 41.

reference to the highest of all subjects, language to be intelligible must be adapted (reduced, even) to the low level of the hearer's capacity. This is a first principle of speech: but its application at once dissipates the objection before us. "The immortal writer of the *Principia*, it is clear from his later works, did not share the perplexity which some smatterers in astronomy profess to feel, when they observe that the Bible speaks on these subjects in the common language of all mankind. When we are told for instance, that 'the sun was risen upon the earth, when Lot entered Zoar,' it is not Newton who complains that we do not read, in its place, a scientific statement such as this,—'that Palestine had revolved, when Lot entered the city, until its tangent plane coincided once more with a radius vector from the sun.'"¹⁷ The fact is, that those statements of the motions of the heavenly bodies which are couched in language most strictly scientific, contain, after all, not absolute but merely relative truth; while popular language itself, so far from being simply false, is also relatively true. Practical astronomers have been compelled to introduce a large variety of technical terms, all framed on precisely the same principles, and moulded by the same laws of thought, as the phrases of Scripture and of common life. Such, for instance, are the transits of Venus and Mercury, the occultation of stars behind the moon, the contact of the sun and moon in an eclipse, the immersion and emersion of Jupiter's satellites, the transit instrument for observing the transit of stars across the meridian, their elevation by refraction, and depression by parallax, the preceding and following side of the heavens, right and oblique ascension, the entrance of stars into the field of the telescope, and the upper and lower culmination of circumpolar stars, when they either pass the zenith or graze the horizon. These are a few conspicuous examples of a fixed and constant law of scientific language, which runs through the whole range of practical and instrumental astronomy. The maxim which charges the Bible with scientific falsehood because of its astronomical phrases, fastens the same charge on the "Nautical Almanac," and the "Connaissance des Temps," and indeed on

¹⁷ *The Bible and Modern Thought*; p. 310.

every record whatever of the materials or the results of modern astronomy.¹⁸ Nothing therefore can be more certain than that the use of popular rather than philosophical language in various parts of God's Word, is a *necessity* arising from the circumstances of the case ; and therefore, so far from affording any ground for objection, it constitutes its strongest commendation.

Third : It is alleged that in Scripture we have conflicting and contradictory accounts of the same transaction ; they cannot both be true ; and if one of them is false, why may not both be so ?

Answer : It is the allegation, and that alone, that is false. When the accounts are really contradictory (—a rare occurrence,) they have never been shewn to refer to the same transaction ; and when they do refer to the same transaction, they are never contradictory.

As an example, we may select the Inscription on the Cross, as recorded by the four Evangelists. And we make this selection the rather, not only because it has been paraded by our opponents as proving this charge, but as being also “an *undoubted* example of the absurdity ” of the argument maintained by “the advocates for the verbal and literal exactness of each Gospel.”

Now what is literal accuracy ? In order to be literally accurate, must I always give every word of a speech I report, or narrate every successive gesture or movement of everybody engaged in any transaction ? The idea is grossly absurd. It could not be done. I *must* select what appear to me to be the salient parts of the speech, or of the transaction ; and so far as I relate what did occur, my statement is *literally correct*. With this literal accuracy the variations of the evangelists are in most perfect accord. They are variations arising from omission ; not from antagonism. One does not call Him Jesus of Capernaum, and another Jesus of Nazareth ; the title, King of the Jews is not in conflict with a rival title, King of the Romans. The records in the Gospel are not literal transcriptions of every letter in Pilate's writing : but for evidential purposes they are far better, for they are far more natural.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 312.

They afford mutual corroboration to each other, by means of their literal agreement. The "Title" nailed on the cross was, we are told, "The King of the Jews;" and such really was the fact of the case. These simple words contained the whole charge, and the whole crime. St. Mark therefore, with the strictest accuracy, says, "The superscription of his accusation was 'The King of the Jews.'" It appears however, that in writing the title, Pilate had prefixed the name and residence of the offender, obviously intending to irritate and annoy the rulers of the Jews. In full, therefore, the superscription was, "Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews;" and there were three copies of it, in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. The question in dispute therefore simply amounts to this :—Can a man, writing under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, give us the *substance* of any speech without contradicting another writer, who (for reasons often obvious enough) has given the same speech *in extenso*, word for word ? The affirmative is undeniable. When men argue as if an inspired writer could tell the truth only by narrating everything that was done, and retailing every word that was spoken, they are directly contravening the usage of every day life. A judge in a court of common law, is too familiar with conflicting testimony of this sort to make it any objection to a man's evidence. He frequently receives totally different narratives of the same transaction, all of which are literally and strictly true, and fall into their places naturally enough in a cross-examination, though at first they seemed incapable of any kind of adjustment. Of this kind are nearly all the alleged contradictions found in Holy Scripture.

Of those which remain ; i.e. of contradictions clearly absolute and final, it is to be observed that the narratives do not refer to the same events ; and consequently they present no contradiction whatever. It cannot be doubted that on different occasions our Lord would repeat the same words : the "sermon on the mount," recorded by St. Matthew (ch. v.), and the sermon on the plain, recorded by St. Luke (ch. vi.), may be cited in proof. Still more certain is it that on different occasions he repeated the same actions ; as in the innumerable miracles of healing. And thus, when the occasion is not marked with precision, it is no wonder that the discrepancies in some circumstantial details

should at first sight appear utterly irreconcileable. Professor Gaußen has happily illustrated this by a reference to the history of the first Napoleon. Suppose a Hindu pundit to have before him three succinct but veritable histories. In one he reads that by the taking of Paris, preceded by much bloodshed at the gates of that capital, Napoleon was compelled to abdicate ; and that an English frigate was commissioned to transport him to an island in the Mediterranean. A second relates how, vanquished by the English, who made themselves masters of Paris without opposition, he was transported by them to St Helena ; whither General Bertrand desired to follow him, and where he breathed his last in the arms of that faithful servant. A third declares that the fallen Emperor was accompanied in his exile by Generals Gourgaud, Bertrand, and Montholon. All these narratives would be strictly true ; and yet how absolute and final are the contradictions they contain ! St. Helena in the Mediterranean forsooth ! Paris taken without a blow ; and Paris taken after a bloody battle at the gates ! One general by one account ; and three by another !

Thus St. Mark, in the account of the resurrection, (xvi. 5) is reconciled with St. Luke (xxiv. 4). There were two men ; and without affirming that there was only one, St. Luke mentions that one who was sitting on the right side, and who addressed them. Just as in Matt. xx. 30 we read of two blind men, while the parallel passages (Mark x. 46, and Lu. xviii. 35) speak only of that one more remarkable, or (as appears from his designation) better known than the other. This transaction however is supposed to involve another difficulty. The two first evangelists relate the event as occurring on the departure from Jericho : the last, by uniting (as is so usual with him) in his narrative two successive circumstances of the same event, seems to place it in the approach to that town. But sever this connection ; i.e. treat the narrative as you treat the twofold statement as to the taking of Paris ; and all is harmonized at once. What did take place on the approach to Jericho was this : Bartimæus heard the passing of the multitude and asked what it meant. And it is most important to be observed that St. Luke is the only evangelist who mentions this circumstance ; a circumstance which (as St. Luke rightly relates) occurred as

Jericho was approached. But the answer showed the inquirer that this was an opportunity not to be lost. Accordingly, while Jesus is tarrying as the guest of Zaccheus, he hastens to secure a place where he might succeed in arresting His attention on his departure from the house. Nothing could be more natural than that while thus waiting until the journey to Jerusalem should be resumed, he should be joined by another poor man in the same pitiable condition, and who now began to be actuated by the same hope. The procession again set forth; and this time Bartimæus had taken good care not to be left behind when "Jesus of Nazareth passed by." He began to cry aloud for help and healing; so did his companion, though not with the prominence of Bartimæus; their prayer was heard and answered; and with reopened eyes, suffused with grateful tears, they "followed Jesus in the way."

On two separate occasions, our Lord, moved with compassion, fed a famished multitude in the wilderness. Between these two miracles there are points of resemblance so numerous and striking, that had it so happened that two of the evangelists had related only the first, and two others only the second, both accounts would unquestioningly have been referred to the same event, and then what an outcry about contradictions! Five thousand men fed with five loaves; four thousand men fed with seven: twelve baskets (*κοφίνων*) taken away in the one case; seven hampers (*σπυρίδας*) in the other! St. Luke and St. John mention the first only; if Matthew and Mark, who relate the second, had not also reported the first, what a demonstration would our opponents have made! And yet their precipitancy would have been just as rash and wrong as that of the sage of Benares in the case of Napoleon above supposed.

The true account of the matter, then—a statement of the fact rather than a theory in relation to it—appears to be this. Inspiration belongs to the whole of Scripture, while Revelation is confined to those acts of the Spirit by which truths previously unknown were communicated to men. *All* Scripture is inspired, and the new truths of Scripture are revealed; or as it has been well expressed, Inspiration discovers new truth, and superintends the communication of the old. In the first and

highest sense it is sometimes called the inspiration of *suggestion*: and by this it was that the apostle Paul was taught the whole of Christianity.¹⁹ In the lower sense, by which the sacred Writers were enabled rightly to understand, and infallibly to communicate things with which in part or in whole they were previously acquainted, it has been called the inspiration of *superintendency*. But this superintendence is not less supernatural than this suggestion; and the record sealed by both, is—throughout every part—of equal authority. Its Inspiration is Plenary.

It is also Verbal. Verbal Inspiration may be regarded as being of three kinds. Of the first are those instances in which God himself speaks or writes: e.g., the Two Tables of Stone. Of the second are those in which God dictates the very words made use of; as in many of the prophecies, and many of the Mosaic ordinances. And the third kind is that in which (according to Abp. Usher's illustration) the Inspired Writers are as secretaries who have received their instructions, but are left to choose their own words: God overruling their judgment and all their faculties in a mysterious manner which He alone can comprehend. So that, practically, this last is as really verbal as the other two.²⁰

Those who doubt this, should observe, as it regards the Old Testament, the frequency of the occasions, as well as the variety and particularity of the modes, used by our Lord to impress upon it the seal of His authority. At the very commencement of His ministry he endorses it with that emphatic sanction which on another occasion is used to ratify His own utterance.¹ In the same discourse He rests “the golden maxim” not simply upon his own Divine authority; nor on its evident agreement with instincts of natural equity. The reason which enforces it is of another kind. It is the sum of “the law and the prophets.” It concentrates the various lessons of social duty, which God had given in such various forms and portions

¹⁹ Gal. i. 12; Ep. iii. 3.

²⁰ On this topic see especially “The Verbal Inspiration of the Old and New Testament maintained and established: by R.

Haldane, Esq. Edin. 1830;” and Prof. Gaußen's “Theopneustia” ch. v.

²¹ Cf. Matt. v. 18; Lu. xvi. 17; with Matt. xxiv. 35.

throughout the range of the Old Testament. When He was tempted He triumphed by this one weapon—"It is written!" And when He suffered, He could not die until—to their very minutest particular—the Scriptures were fulfilled. The way in which He quoted the words of Asaph, words which modern criticism would attribute to the unreflecting fervour of the psalmist or the rapt inspiration of his poetry, is hardly less remarkable than the decisive utterance with which he anticipates and answers all objections to the quotation. His argument is based on a single word, a word used figuratively, with poetic licence (!), and yet that argument is irrefragable, for that word is immovable; it "came not by will of man," and it shall outlive the heavens, for "The Scripture cannot be broken!"²²

The inspiration and authority of the New Testament has other evidence, "from plain analogy with the Old Testament, from the character of the Gospel dispensation, from the revealed rank of the Apostles as even higher than the prophets, from the direct averments of St. Paul concerning his own Epistles, and his indirect testimony to St. Luke's writings and the earlier Gospels, from the cumulative testimonies of St. Peter and St. Jude, from the statements of the fourth Gospel, and the full, emphatic, and reiterated declarations of the Apocalypse, like a keystone to the whole."²³ That the inspiration which the Apostles claimed, and of which they were conscious, was both verbal and plenary, is evident from the fact that this teaching, as defined by themselves, was "not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth."²⁴ And that this claim, this consciousness had ample warrant, we know on the highest of all authority—the promise of their Master concerning that "Spirit of Truth" who should ABIDE with them for ever, and lead them into ALL truth.

Thus, in the Gospels and the Epistles, the language of au-

²² John x. 34, 35; Ps. lxxxii. 6
In Gal. iii. 16, St. Paul bases his argument upon (less than a word!) the mere use of a word in the singular as opposed to the plural. "He saith not 'And to seeds' . . . but . . . 'And to thy seed; ' which

is Christ."

²³ See these particulars elaborated with conclusive completeness by the Rev. T. R. Birks, in "The Bible and Modern Thought," ch. xi.

²⁴ 1 Co. ii. 13.

thority is substantially the same as in the prophets' appeal "to the Law and to the Testimony." "It is written," is the decision for every doubt; and "Have ye not read in the Scriptures?" is the rebuke for every form of ignorance and error. With these facts before us, there is but one conclusion possible. It is, that the testimony already adduced is the utterance of literal and absolute Truth:—"ALL Scripture is given by inspiration of God;" and "THE SCRIPTURE CANNOT BE BROKEN!"

CHAPTER VII.

SCRIPTURE AND SCIENCE.

"The mass of evidence in favor of the divine inspiration of the Bible is too great to be set aside by anything short of scientific *demonstration*." But "I do not believe that *even the probabilities* of any science are in collision with Scripture."—*Religion of Geology*: p. 18.

THE history of the conflicts between religion and science is very instructive. According to a very common view, the two things have always been afraid of each other ; always fancying it impossible that they might sit side by side together on the throne of Eternal Truth. It is a causeless, and therefore a foolish strife : for what Kepler beautifully calls "the finger of God, and the tongue of God"—His works and His word—can never be contrary the one to the other. Whatever the discrepancy, it must be of our own making. We have generalized too hastily the facts of science ; or we have interpreted too superficially the words of Scripture. This has been the history of all past disagreements ; and one after another, we have seen alleged discrepancies vanish, and true science laying her offering at the footstool of the truth of God.

These disagreements however, such as they have been, could hardly have arisen without a good deal of prepossession and prejudice ; prepossession and prejudice, it must be confessed, not always on one side. The tone adopted towards their opponents by some Christian advocates has not always been quite conciliatory. It would have been more so had those who indulged it been better informed. An opponent's argument is easily undervalued when it is not understood : but then it is

not so easily refuted. The battle-field of scepticism lies no longer in the region of metaphysics, or history, or biblical interpretation. But the enemy has intrenched himself within the domains of natural science ; and if he is to be dislodged, his chosen weapons must be turned against himself :—skeletons, and trees, and stones ; not mere vague abstractions. The illusory “Vestiges of the Creation” disappear only when we are shewn the true “Footprints of the Creator :” and the multiform varieties, the specious generalities of the development hypothesis are not to be refuted without the particular and careful induction of a Sedgwick and a Miller. “Although,” says an eminent authority, “Although I fear that the theologians are not aware of the fact, yet probably the doctrines of materialism are more widely embraced at this day than almost any other religious error.”¹ But the arguments by which materialism is defended are among the most subtle in the whole range of theology and natural science ; and without a knowledge of that science they can neither be appreciated nor refuted. The mere metaphysical abstractions by which they are usually met excite only the contempt of the physiological materialist. Is this a state of things in which the Christian can afford to let his adversaries remain in possession of the field, their own chosen battle-ground though it be ? Not such a course was his

“Who would have foiled at their own play
A dozen would-be’s of the modern day.”²

The science just now supposed to be in most direct antagonism to the Bible, is Geology. But what could be better calculated to excite the contempt of a geologist than to hear his opponent affirming that the fossilized remains found in the rocks, and occurring in all states, from an animal or plant little changed, to a complete conversion into stone, were never real animals and plants, but only resemblances ; that the marks of fusion and erosion, presented by the rocks, are not to be taken as evidences that they have undergone such processes, but only that it has pleased God to give them that appearance ; and that it was as easy for God to create them in that form as in any

¹ Professor Hitchcock.

² See Cowper’s “Conversation.”

other. It is no light presumption against such a supposition, that no man who has carefully examined rocks and organic remains is its advocate. The cause of the Bible can only suffer, when its defence makes the geologist feel "very much as a good Greek scholar would, who should read a severe critique upon the style of Isocrates or Demosthenes, and before he had finished the review, should discover internal evidence that the writer had never learned the Greek alphabet."

On the other hand, it cannot be denied that this opposition to science, though short-sighted and unwise, has not been unprovoked. The tone adopted by those who have maintained the antagonism of science towards the Bible has been contemptuously defiant. Many a paeon has been sung for a victory never achieved. At one time, those learned writers who enlighten us on the formation of language, discover proofs (! forsooth) that it is not possible for all the dialects of the world to have had one common origin. At another, the celebrated tables of Indian history are produced, and believers in Christianity are expected to abandon their belief at the bidding of historic records long anterior to the Mosaic era. But it is a short-lived triumph. Even Laplace, no special friend to Christianity, shows that some of the supposed facts on which those tables were based were astronomically impossible; while Sir William Jones led up the band of Christian scholars who demonstrated affinities between all the languages of earth, explicable only on the hypothesis of one primary root.

When, therefore, one meets with people impudently affirming —on the strength of Bishop Colenso's assertions, or Baron Bunsen's calculations, or Dr Williams' "remorseless criticisms," or the manufactured antiquities of Abbeville—that "Moses and his Pentateuch are smashed;" it is impossible not to remember that that catastrophe is merely of the nominal and imaginary kind that has happened so often already; and to infer that the extraordinary vitality which has survived such treatment so long may very well survive to the end. But what about the Zodiacs of Denderah? Some persons indeed seem so very innocent of all knowledge on that subject, that it may be but an act of common charity to remind them of the principal facts.

On the ceiling of a temple at Denderah, in Upper Egypt, were found, some forty years ago, certain mysterious paintings, apparently astronomical, and still known as the Zodiae of Denderah. They were pronounced to be three thousand, four thousand, and even seven thousand years old.

Somewhat similar representations were found in two temples at Esneh. It was in vain that their astronomical character was denied by travellers like Dr Richardson, who after the most careful examination assigned weighty (not to say conclusive) reasons for his decision. In vain did an eminent mathematician like M. Biot fix the date of the oldest of them at only 716 B.C. Until at length, patient research brought to light the fact that the smaller temple at Esneh, (pronounced by some to be two or three thousand years prior to the Christian era,) was built, and the paintings executed by two Egyptians, in the tenth year of the Roman Emperor Antoninus (i.e., A.D. 147); while a Greek inscription over the portico of the temple at Denderah, declared it to have been dedicated to the safety of the Emperor Tiberius. "Ainsi donc," adds Champollion, (Egypte, p. 110), "l'antiquité du pronaos d'Esneh est incontestablement fixée : sa construction ne remonte pas au-delà de l'empereur Claude : ses sculptures descendront jusqu'à Caracalla, et du nombre de celles-ci est le fameux zodiaque dont on a tant parlé."

In like manner, certain inscriptions found on a mummy at Thebes, much like those of the zodiac at Denderah, were found to be astrological tables respecting the destiny of the person whose body was embalmed, and *not astronomical tables at all*. They gave his name and parentage; with the date of his birth (Jan. 12, A.D. 95) and death (June 2, 106). And yet for this mummy and the inscription thereon found, there had been claimed an antiquity of five or six thousand years. Thus ended the dazzling visions of high antiquity for Egypt, and the consequent refutation of the Mosaic chronology, based on the discoveries at Denderah, Esneh, and Thebes.

But these attempts to impugn the veracity of the Inspired Record, though perhaps more grossly ridiculous, were not more signally abortive, than those more recent ones by which they have been followed. As if to cover their defeat, the promoters

of these schemes became more pretentious as they became less successful. They had utterly failed to disprove the date of Creation : might it not be possible to disprove the fact ? At all events they would try.

Following the investigations of Palissy, and the opinions of Buffon, boldly announced and widely discussed, the Huttonian theory seemed strongly to confirm both. Hutton contended that the ruins of an older world were visible in the composition of this ; that there were no traces of a beginning, and no prospect of an end ; that there had been at least three distinct periods of animal existence before the introduction of man ; and that all the changes of the globe had been effected by the agency of causes which were then acting gradually upon it. The views maintained by the transcendental anatomists of France, with Geoffrey St. Hilaire at their head, and Lamarck for their ablest exponent, were all in favour of a progressive advance in creation—a gradual development from the monad up to man. The geologists of that day too, strongly affirmed the same doctrine ; and even from astronomy itself was at last extorted a hesitating and reluctant assent.

The patch of light discovered in the girdle of Andromeda, by Simon Marius, in 1612, is the first recorded discovery of the nebulae, distinctively so called, outside the milky-way. Cysatus in 1618, and Huyghens in 1656, discovered independently the great nebula in the sword-belt of Orion. In 1660, Hevelius noticed that between the head and bow of Sagittarius. The one near to Centauri was discovered by Halley in 1677 ; and this when lately observed by Sir John Herschel at the Cape, was pronounced by him as beyond all comparison the richest and largest object of the kind in the heavens ; having a diameter equal to two-thirds that of the moon. In 1681 Kirch discovered a nebulous spot near the right, or northern, foot of Antinous ; and in 1714 Halley discovered the brilliant and remarkable nebula between the stars ζ and η in the constellation Hercules. In 1716, when Halley undertook an enumeration of all the known nebulae, these six were all that had been discovered. But Lacaille, some thirty years after, determined the position of twenty-eight others ; and in 1771, Messier communicated to the Academy of Sciences a catalogue con-

taining sixty-eight new ones ; making in all one hundred and three.³

The nebulæ now began to assume the position they afterwards occupied : they were the enigma of the universe. "What were those spots of light in the undiscovered depths of infinite ?" To this question two answers were given. Lacaille suggested that "the nebulæ were of two kinds, some really, others only apparently such ;" the latter being resolvable into stars by increased magnifying powers, while the real nebulæ consisted of diffuse luminous matter, distributed in different portions of the celestial vault.⁴ And this answer was generally received. Herschel however, advanced, and maintained for years, a different opinion. So many of the nebulæ seen by ordinary instruments had, by his larger telescopes, been resolved into clusters of stars, that he asserted his belief that *all* nebulæ consist of such clusters ; and that there exists no essential difference between those of the most dissimilar appearance : that dissimilarity being the result of the greater or less distance, or greater or less condensation of the component stars.

But even this eminent astronomer was compelled at last to modify his opinion. Increased telescopic power brought into view other nebulous spots, in positions where their existence had not been at all suspected. It showed them apparently, in every state of condensation, from a thin pale cloud to brilliant but unresolvable light. It suggested that throughout the wide regions of immensity there *might* be dispersed a sort of elementary sidereal matter which gradually subsided into denser bodies. It revealed apparent indications of every stage of their condensing progress ; and it exhibited the more or less advanced state of a nebula towards its aggregation into distinct stars (and the aggregation of these stars themselves towards a denser nucleus) as indications of the periods of time, the vast sidereal eras, through which they had respectively passed.

³ But in contributions to this portion of astronomical science, Sir Wm. Herschel far outstripped all competitors. In the years 1786—1802 he published three

catalogues of nebulæ or clusters of stars, making altogether 2,500.

⁴ See Memoirs of the Academy of Sciences for 1755.

Can we marvel that the human mind became intoxicated by this grand though illegitimate conception? That the creative genius of La Place should see therein the mode of the formation of a universe—yea, of *our own* universe? That the Christian student of science should for a season feel perplexed, and the infidel raise a shout of rejoicing? For the first time did atheism, and those semi-atheistic systems, Pantheism and Buddhism, find a show of evidence in their favour. The sceptic laughed; the pseudo-philosopher transferred us from the rule of a living, operating and intelligent Deity, to that of mere principles and laws. And even some observant Christians began to think it possible that our ideas of creation would have to be modified. In one word: The Nebular Theory prevailed.

This theory, then, is the result of the Huttonian theory applied to astronomy. Assuming that the varieties of nebulous appearance represented planets and stars in the different periods of their growth, (some half-formed, and others but one degree removed from the condition of the rudimental material,) the conclusion was unhesitatingly adopted that these bodies were in process of formation under the direction of the same natural force. To this conclusion was added another; that since all the stages of growth exist, then the agencies by which they are now produced must be the same as they were in the beginning. And further: that as these phenomena appear to be developing themselves gradually, without the aid of any supernatural cause, they must depend upon and result from laws within the system itself. By this course of reasoning the only element wanting in the development theory was supplied by astronomers.

It was now supposed that all the heavenly bodies were elaborated out of this nebulous material by the forces of attraction and radiation. That in the beginning, this attenuated fire-cloud filled all space; and that by *some cause unknown*, and at some period equally uncertain, a nucleus was formed, to which this nebulous matter was drawn by the force of attraction, and around which it commenced its revolutions. After a certain length of time, the first planet was thrown off from the great primary; and then again another. These in turn threw off their satellites; and thus the process was continued until this globe was swung into its orbit. Vast as were these changes,

they were all effected without the aid of any other agency than those of attraction and radiation. There was no superior CAUSE of Causes ; no POWER behind the clouds, moving the machinery, and ordering the results.

This globe thus (not created, but) condensed (!) was at first covered with water ; and was therefore unfit for anything but marine vegetable life, and the lowest order of mollusca. These were forced into existence by some electric or chemical agency, as yet imperfectly understood, but when once in existence, they became the Adams of the earth, and the parents of a numerous and infinitely varied progeny. Thus were the Nebulous Theory and the Development Theory interwoven together ; and a complete system of the world constructed out of the two. Enunciating this system, the “ Inductive Philosopher ” boasted that his position was impregnable ; and very confidently assured us that “ there never had been such a thing as *creation*, in the generally received sense of the term.” Q. E. D.

It is not yet twenty years since the jubilant exultation of these pseudo-scientific contemners of Scripture was at its height. The so-called “ Vestiges of the Natural History of the Creation ” were published to propagate “ a somewhat different idea of organic creation from what has hitherto been generally entertained.”⁵ Its popularity was such that three editions were called for in two months. This is the substance of its conclusions :—“ The whole train of animated beings, from the simplest and oldest, up to the highest and most recent, are, then, to be regarded as a series of *advances of the principle of development.* . . . ”⁶ And again :—“ The whole is complete on one principle. The masses of space are formed by law ; law makes them in due time theatres of existence for plants and animals ; sensation, disposition, intellect, are all in like manner developed and sustained in action by law. It is most interesting to observe into how small a field the whole of the mysteries of nature thus ultimately resolve themselves. The inorganic has been thought to have one final comprehensive law, *gravitation*. The organic, the other great department of mundane things, rests in like manner on one law, and that is—DEVELOPMENT.”

⁵ P. 156. (Third Edition.)

⁶ P. 208.

Alas for human wisdom ! These sage conclusions were hardly uttered before Lord Rosse's telescope made it undeniably certain that their first premises were mere conjectures ; and (worse still) conjectures contradicted by fact. The nebulae were not nebulous ! "Spot after spot of soft white milky light was resolved into distinct starry clusters, indicative of the truth originally propounded by Sir Wm. Herschel, which soon after shone with fulgence on the minds of nearly all the students of the firmament, that all the nebulae were in reality distinct galaxies or clusters of stars, whose immense distance hid from the observer all but the milky stream of their *commingled rays.*"⁷ The resolution of Orion's "soft white cloud" into a gorgeous bed of stars, by the Parsonstown instrument, was especially received as "so strong a confirmation of this view, as to cause it to be received by most living astronomers for indisputable truth, and again remodel the opinions of the scientific world." For this spot in Orion had been looked upon as the very type of unresolvable nebulosity ; even Sir John Herschel having said of it :—"In all the [resolvable] nebulae the observer remarks (whatever be the magnifying power) points of starlight, or he thinks that such would be perceived, if the vision was rendered more distinct. The nebula in Orion produces quite a different sensation. It does not suggest any idea of stars." By the power of the same great telescope, many other nebulae previously pronounced unresolvable, have been already resolved. The shapes of others, classed as globular, annular, and perforated nebulae, have been entirely changed. Some of those upon whose form and appearance the once widely-prevalent notion of self-creation was especially founded, have proved to be really of a very different form and appearance from that on which those notions were based. In the words of Dr Lardner, "There is no reason to doubt that the constitution of these objects is the same as that of other nebulae ; and that they are in fact clusters of stars, which, by mutual proximity and vast distance, are reduced to the [apparent] form of planetary discs." While on the gratuitous and perfectly unwarrantable hypothesis of diffuse ne-

⁷ See an able article on this subject in the Christian Observer, Jan. 1860.

bulous matter, the same author observes in another place, that "Such an hypothesis is not needed to explain appearances which are so much more obviously and simply explicable by the admission of a gradation of distances." And, to cite but one other authority, the "Radcliffe Observer" tells us "we may say of this theory, which has been discussed beyond its merits, that it would probably never have been framed if the constitution of the nebulae which we see in the heavens had been understood as well as it is now."⁸ Thus by increased knowledge was the Nebular Theory exploded; and with it, the very foundations of the Theory of "Creation by Law."

Precisely the same thing occurred in Geology. The gradual advance, the progressive development which this theory required, turned out, on further investigation, never to have existed. On a cursory and general view indeed the theory seemed to be maintained. In the oldest rocks we find chiefly the more simple invertebrate animals; and the vertebrated tribes appear first in the form of fish, then of reptiles, then of birds, after that of animals, and last of all of man. What better confirmation could be wished than this gradually expanding series? But the tables are turned the moment we descend to particulars. Dicotyledonous plants are found to exist in the coal measures; and this well known fact is of itself fatal to the theory of development. "The lower Silurian," says Sir Roderick Murchison, in 1847, "is no longer to be viewed as an invertebrate period; for the onchus has been found in the Llandeilo Flags, and in the lower Silurian rocks of Bala." It is also a most important fact that this fish of the oldest rock was not, as the development scheme would require, of a low organization, but quite high on the scale of fishes. The same is true of all the earliest species of this class. "All our most ancient fossil fishes," says Professor Sedgwick, "belong to a high organic type; and the very oldest species that are well determined fall naturally into an order of fishes which Owen and Müller place, not at the bottom, but at the top of the whole class."⁹ The asterolepis of Stromness too, one of the fishes found in the old red sandstone, and sometimes more than twenty feet long, "instead of being,

⁸ "Replies to Essays and Re-views," p. 507.

⁹ Discourse on the Studies of the University: Pref. p. lxiv.

as the development hypothesis would require, a fish low in its organization, seems to have ranged on the level of the highest ichthyic-reptilian families ever called into existence.”¹⁰ Nay more; it even appears that in many families of animals, not only were the first species that appeared of high organization, but there was a gradual degradation among those that were created afterwards; “that the several dynasties were introduced, not in their lower, but in their higher forms; and that in short, in the imposing programme of the creation, it was arranged, as a general rule, that in each of the great divisions of the procession the magnates should walk first.”¹¹ Among the invertebrate animals are numerous examples of the deterioration of a race. M. Alcide D’Orbigny, one of the most accomplished of living palaeontologists, speaks thus¹² of the cephalopods found in the oldest rocks:—“See then, the result; the cephalopods, the most perfect of the molluscs, which lived in the early period of the world, show a progress of degradation in their generic forms. We insist on this fact relative to the cephalopods, which we shall hereafter compare with the less perfect classes of molluscs, since it must lead to the conclusion that the molluscs, as to their classes, have certainly retrograded from the compound to the simple, or from the more to the less perfect.” Such facts as these are absolutely fatal to the hypothesis of development: and geology abounds with them.

Waving, for the present, the physiological fallacies of this oft-repeated theory, it is important to remember the lessons which its history furnishes, in their application to the other theories of similar character by which it has been succeeded. That one, for instance, which just now is specially prominent, The High Antiquity of the Human Race, is asserted with as much assurance and as little evidence as characterized the Theory of Development twenty years ago. There is the same substitution of assumption for proof, the same mere guessing, the same vague generalizing, the same boundless conjecture, and the same contemptuous disregard of facts which it would be inconvenient to notice, and impossible to gainsay.

¹⁰ Hugh Miller: “Footprints of the Creator.”

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² In his *Cours Elementaire de Paleontologie et de Geologie*.

We proceed to the proof. Of the many marked and striking coincidences between geology and Scripture¹³ none were more universally admitted five years ago—and with the exception of the small knot of persons who have adopted this theory, none are more firmly established even now,—than these two:—

Revelation and geology both agree in stating man to be the last of created animals; they both agree too in ascribing the creation of man to a very recent date, not above some 6,000 or 7,000 years ago.

The records of the rocks disclose the existence (in periods past and gone) of fishes, reptiles, birds, and at last, mammalia: but no portion or particle of any human being. Thus, fifty years ago, Baron Cuvier said,—“The human remains did not exist in the countries in which the fossil bones of animals have been discovered, at the epoch when these bones were covered up.”¹⁴ A little later, Sir Humphrey Davy remarked, that “in none of the geological formations have the remains of man, or any of his works, been discovered; and the comparatively recent existence of man as the master of the globe, is as certain as the destruction of a former and a different order of things.” Then followed Dr. Buckland, who said, “No conclusion is more fully established, than the important fact of the total absence of any vestiges of the human species throughout the entire series of geological formations.”¹⁵ And more recently, we have Professor Phillips, who says, “Geology, agreeing with the authority of Scripture in the late date of man, and the races of beings associated with him, adds its own testimony of pre-Adamite beings:”¹⁶ and Mr. Page, who adds, “So far as geological evidence goes, we have no traces of man or his works, till we arrive at the superficial accumulations, the cave deposits and peat mosses of the present period.”¹⁷ Nothing, therefore, can be more complete than the concurrent agreement with Scripture, of all the chief authorities on this central fact. As to the date of the commencement of the present, the “recent,”

¹³ Prof. Hitchcock (Religion of Geology, p. 385) particularizes seven such points of agreement. Dr. Brewer (Theology in Science p. 104) specifies ten.

¹⁴ Cuvier: Theory of the Earth, p. 131.

¹⁵ Vol. 1. p. 101.

¹⁶ Life on the Earth, p. 47.

¹⁷ Life of the Globe, p. 214.

or "human" period, it is natural that most persons should be averse to giving any opinion; but even here several have spoken. Thus, Cuvier: "I am of opinion with Messrs. Deluc and Dolomieu, that if there is any circumstance thoroughly established in geology, it is, that the crust of our globe has been subject to a great and sudden revolution, the epoch of which cannot be dated much farther back than five or six thousand years ago."¹⁸ To the same purpose speaks Dr. Lardner, who tells us that geology finds in the face of nature, various "natural chronometers by which the age of the human race may be estimated; and it is as remarkable as it is satisfactory, that the results are in no discordance with the dates of creation supplied by chronology based on tradition and revelation. By the general accordance of geological facts, it appears that the present, the human period, has now continued for not more than six or seven thousand years."¹⁹ And similarly, Professor Hitchcock declares that geology "shews us equally with revelation that the existing races of animals and plants on the globe were created at a comparatively recent epoch, and that man commenced his existence not more than six thousand years ago."²⁰ Elsewhere, the same authority thus states the evidence for this assertion:—"That man was among the very last of the animals created, is made certain by the fact that his remains are found only in the highest part of alluvium. This is rarely more than one hundred feet in thickness, while the other fossiliferous strata, lying beneath the alluvium, are six miles thick. Hence man was not in existence during all the period in which these six miles of strata were in a course of deposition, and he has existed only during the comparatively short period in which the one hundred feet of alluvium have been formed; nay, during only a small part of the alluvial period. His bones, having the same chemical composition as the bones of other animals, are no more liable to decay; and therefore, had he lived and died in any of the periods preceding the alluvial, his bones must have been mixed with those of other animals belonging to those periods. But they are not thus found in a single well-authenticated instance, and therefore, his existence

¹⁸ Theory of the Earth: p. 171. ¹⁹ Lardner's Geology, p. 157.

²⁰ Religion of Geology, p. 385.

has been limited to the alluvial period. Hence he must have been created and placed upon the globe (such is the testimony of geology,) during the latter part of the alluvial period.”²¹

If now we enquire what can be opposed to this cumulative and concurrent testimony in favor of Revelation, we shall find it in its most concentrated form in the exhaustive volume of Sir Charles Lyell.

He begins with “Danish peat and shell mounds, and Swiss lake-dwellings.” Of the first of these he says, “The minimum of time required for the formation of so much peat must, according to the estimate of Steenstrup and other good authorities, have amounted to at least 4000 years.” But he adds, “There is nothing in the observed rate of the growth of peat opposed to the conclusion that the number of centuries may not have been four times as great; even though the signs of man’s existence have not yet been traced down to the lowest or amorphous stratum.”²²

We have next a description of the “ancient Swiss lake-dwellings,” and of the various periods of iron, bronze, and stone, to which they are supposed to belong. Their respective antiquity is given on the calculations of several continental geologists. Thus: “M. Morlot assuming the Roman period to represent an antiquity of from sixteen to eighteen centuries, assigns to the bronze period a date of between 3000 and 4000 years, and to the stone period an age of from 5000 to 7000.”²³

²¹ *Ibid.* pp. 146, 147, 57.

²² “Geological Evidences of the Antiquity of Man:” p. 17.

²³ But thus to treat these ages (of stone, of bronze, of iron,) as if they succeeded each other in a regular chronological sequence, is to be guilty of a most unwarranted assumption. The true representation of the matter is to be found in the words of Dr. Wilson, (“Pre-historic Man,” vol. i. p. 186,) namely, that such relics “belong to one condition of man, in rela-

tion to the progress of civilization, though pertaining to many periods of the world’s history, and the most widely separated areas of the globe.”

Thus, the age of stone, as it is called, in any one country, may have been later or earlier by centuries than the same age in another. The proof of this is evident to every body; for in some parts of the world the age of stone has not even yet come to an end. “The stone axe of the South Sea

"Another calculation has been made by M. Troyon. . . . Assuming the lake to have retreated at the same rate before the Roman period, the pile works of Chamblon, which are of the bronze period, must be at least 3300 years old."

A third calculation is based on the same premises—the ever-recurring *assumption* : "Assuming that a similar rate of the conversion of water into marshy land prevailed antecedently, we should require an addition of sixty centuries for the growth of the morass. . . . in all, 6750 years."²⁴

After a brief account of the Irish lake-dwellings, or Crannoges (of whose antiquity the author ventures on no calculation) we pass on to the "alluvial plain of the Nile," where pieces of burnt brick have been dug up, one from a depth of sixty, and another from a depth of seventy-two feet below the level of the plain. Here again nothing can be done without the preliminary magic of assumption :—

"Were we to assume six inches in a century, the burnt brick met with at a depth of sixty feet would be 12,000 years old." And again :—"Were we to take two and a half inches, a work of art seventy-two feet deep must have been buried more than 30,000 years ago." But in the very same paragraphs it is admitted that the guesses on which these assumptions rest are so very vague, and the date so very groundless, that even in the latter instance (the alleged 30,000 years) "the brick in question might be comparatively very modern."²⁵

From Egypt we are suddenly taken to America ; and first to some "ancient mounds of the valley of the Ohio," from which however no conclusion is drawn adverse to the chronology of Scripture. Next, we are shown the human bones found at

Islander of the 18th century presents a close resemblance to that of the British or Gaulish fabricator of the first or earlier centuries ; and the modern flint lance or arrow-head of the Red Indian can scarcely be distinguished from that found in the most ancient British graves." (Ib. vol. i., p. 265.)

²⁴ Lyell's *Antiquity*, pp. 28, 29.

²⁵ Ib. p. 38. Sir Charles makes the frank avowal that "the experiments instituted by Mr. Horner, in the hope of obtaining an accurate chronometric scale for testing the age of a given thickness of Nile sediment, are not considered by experienced Egyptologists to have been satisfactory."

Santos, in Brazil ; but to these, Sir Charles is unable to assign any date. Of the 50,000 years claimed by Dr. Dowler for the skeleton discovered in the delta of the Mississippi, at the depth of only sixteen feet from the surface, Sir Charles says, "I cannot form an opinion as to the value of the chronological calculations which have led Dr. Dowler" to this conclusion.²⁶ The last instance of this sort given in Sir Charles's third chapter, relates to some coral reefs in Florida, where in a calcareous conglomerate "supposed by Agassiz to be about 10,000 years old, some fossil human remains were found by Count Pourtalais."

The fourth chapter introduces us to the Belgian caverns, and especially to the human bones and flint implements found in the caverns near Liége, by Dr. Schmerling, and by him referred to "the antediluvian period." To these remains Sir Charles declines to assign any positive or even probable date, although agreeing with their discoverer that they had been washed into the caverns where they are now found, through fissures, probably by some great flood.

On the "Fossil human skeleton of the Neanderthal cave," (found in 1857, in the side of a ravine near Düsseldorf,) discussed in the fifth chapter, Sir Charles says, "On the whole, I think it probable that this fossil may be of about the same age as those found by Schmerling in the Liége caverns ; but as no other animal remains were found with it, there is no proof that it may not be newer. Its position lends no countenance whatever to the supposition of its being more ancient."²⁷

²⁶ But of the mud deposit itself, the delta of the Mississippi, Sir Charles supposes, both in his earlier and later writings, that it may have required 100,000 years for its formation.

On the other hand, such eminent naturalists as Dolomieu, Cuvier, and Elie de Beaumont reckon its requirements at *a few thousand years only*. And in Dana's "Manual of Geology" (1863 ; p. 647) where we have the latest measure-

ments of the enlargement of the delta, we have Sir Charles's estimate ("Second Visit," ii., 250,) diminished by nearly three fourths. The data furnished by M. Elie de Beaumont, ("Leçons de Géologie Pratique,") combined with the result of the latest observations, gives for the growth of the delta a period of between 5000 and 6000 years.

²⁷ Lyell's Antiquity, p. 78.

The flint implements found in the valley of the Somme furnish the subject for the next chapter. These were brought to light about the year 1841, by M. Boucher de Perthes, who collected many of them near Abbeville, and who, in his "Antiquités Celtes," published in 1847, styled these ancient tools or weapons "antediluvian." At a later date, another investigator, Dr. Rigolot, obtained several hundreds of these implements from St. Acheul, in the suburbs of Amiens. The valley of the Somme, from Amiens to Abbeville, is about a mile wide. The surrounding district consists of gently undulating elevated plains of chalk, capped here and there by tertiary outliers. Amiens is forty miles from the sea; Abbeville about fourteen. The river valleys in the district are narrow, and exhibit deposits of loam and gravel on their sides; the middle of the valleys being for the most part made up of marsh and peat overlying gravel. The only conclusion at which Sir Charles arrives from the relics here found—found generally in sand or gravel, about twenty or thirty feet from the surface—is, "that the flint tools and their fabricators were coeval with the extinct mammalia embedded in the same strata."²⁸ The same conclusion—"the former co-existence of man with many extinct mammalia"—is arrived at as the result of "a careful exploration of a cave at Brixham, Devon;" also considered in the same chapter.²⁹

The next four chapters are occupied with a wide and abundant review of the whole question of the flint implements. Their discovery, and the description of their character is given in a variety of instances occurring in Picardy, in the valley of the Somme, in the basin of the Seine, in the valley of the Oise, and in England, near Bedford, in Suffolk, in Somerset, in Glamorgan. We have also the description of a burying place found in 1852, at Aurignac, in Southern France. The single result, however, of all these investigations is merely that of which we have already heard—"the contemporaneousness of man and some of the extinct animals."

The eleventh chapter discusses "the fossil man of Denise," and "the human fossil of Natchez, on the Mississippi." But the first of these, besides being of doubtful genuineness, does not

²⁸ Ib., p. 96. ²⁹ Ib., p. 105.

affect the question at issue. Of the second, the fossil of Natchez, Sir Charles pronounces that it is probably not more ancient than the alluvium of the Somme, in which flint implements are found.³⁰

With the next hundred and twenty pages, on "The Glacial Period," we have here no concern. But in the sixteenth chapter we come to the consideration of "the loess," a name given to certain loamy deposits found in the basins of the Rhine, Danube, and other large rivers draining the Alps. But even supposing the human jaw therein discovered to belong to the same period as the bones of the elephants lying near to it, it might still, according to Sir Charles, "have no claims to a higher antiquity than the human remains which Dr. Schmerling disentombed from the Belgian caverns."³¹ The seventeenth and eighteenth chapters discuss Post-glacial Dislocations in Europe and in America, but supply no further facts relative to man. In the nineteenth, Sir Charles comes to his "Recapitulation of Geological Proofs of Man's Antiquity." "And this"—to adopt the words of a writer³² to whom the author is much indebted—"And this is the chapter which must have been read with the keenest disappointment by those who anticipated a complete overthrow of the Mosaic narrative. It might have been entitled, like a chapter in a story of the last century, 'The conclusion, in which nothing is concluded.'" But if it has no new facts it has the old fancies. Thus, *e.g.*,—"The vast distance of time which separated the origin of the higher and lower level gravels of the valley of the Somme, both of them rich in flint implements of similar shape, . . . leads to the conclusion that the state of the arts in those early times remained stationary for almost indefinite periods."³³ And again: "We cannot ascertain at present the limits, whether of the beginning or the end, of the first stone period, when man coexisted with the extinct mammalia, but that it was of great duration we cannot

³⁰ After investigating the circumstances on the spot, Sir Charles thought it quite possible that this relic might have "been dislodged out of some old Indian grave near the top of an adjacent

cliff." See "Lyell's Second Visit to the United States," ii. 197.)

³¹ Lyell's *Antiq.* ch. xvi, p. 340.

³² In the "Christian Observer," vol. xxvi, p. 353.

³³ *Antiq. of Man*, ch. xix., p. 376.

doubt.”³⁴ “Cannot doubt,” indeed! cannot we though? when we review the thoroughly hypothetical foundation for such affirmative conclusions, we cannot help doubting.

For when we review that foundation what do we find? We find “calculations,” “conjectures,” “suppositions,” “conclusions,” anything, everything, but the one thing, which if it alone were present or producible, all the rest might be dispensed with. Of plain, strong, indisputable facts, there is not one. “A human skeleton, found in such circumstances as to force all geologists to admit that it must have lain there for 20,000 years, would be a perplexing difficulty for one who wished to maintain his belief in the narratives of Moses. But no such thing has been discovered. The crust of the earth has been examined in a thousand places; hundreds of eager investigators have striven to gain the glory of a great discovery; but the one thing of which they were all in search, remains at this moment undiscovered.”

To come to particulars:—

I. The Danish peat is at least 4000 years old (we are informed), and may be “four times” as much. MAY be: ah! then it also may NOT be. When Old Hundred’s boast of the Gordon equipage with eight horses, was contradicted as a gross exaggeration, the only producible substantiation was the decisive rejoinder, “You say much more, I’ll make sixteen on ‘em!” If we humbly submit that the 4000 years claimed for this Danish peat is after all in no respect subversive of Scripture, we are warned to take care lest our opponents make sixteen of them.

But waving the consideration of the 16,000 years which *may* be, what shall we say of the 4000 years which (according to Sir Charles) *must* be required. Why, we say in the words of another eminent geologist, that “These assumptions are quite at variance with the statements of the same writer in his ‘Principles of Geology.’ In treating in that work of the recent origin of peat mosses, he quotes the case of Hatfield moss in Yorkshire, ‘which appears clearly to have been a forest 1800 years ago;’ and after giving other instances, states that ‘a consider-

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 378.

able portion of the peat in European peat-bogs is evidently not more ancient than the age of Julius Cæsar,' and, what is most material to the present inquiry, quotes from Gerard, the historian of the valley of the Somme, a statement that in 'the lowest tier of that moss was found a boat loaded with bricks.'"³⁵

Mr Pattison adds that—

"In the 'Philosophical Transactions,' No. 330, the Earl of Cromarty records that in the west of Ross-shire a considerable extent of land was, between the years 1651 and 1699, changed from a forest into a peat-moss, from which turf was cut."

"The frequent discoveries of mediæval objects low down in fen deposits, and the experience of all those who have had to do with the management of peat-land, lead to the conclusion that two thousand years constitute ample allowance for the growth of all the peat on the present surface of the globe."³⁶

II. With respect to the periods of iron, bronze, and stone, it is to be observed

First: that the highest dates here assigned are not irreconcileable with the Scripture chronology. But

Secondly: these high dates cannot be sustained. "The eminent Danish archæologist, Worsaae," attributes to the stone period "an antiquity of at least three thousand years;" and adds, "There are also geological reasons for believing that the bronze period must have prevailed in Denmark five or six hundred years before the birth of Christ."³⁷ So that here we have only three thousand instead of the five, six, or seven thousand, offered us by Sir Charles.

Thirdly: On what sort of data do these high "conclusions" rest? M. Morlot: "ASSUMING the Roman period to represent . . ." M. Troyon: "ASSUMING the lake to have retreated . . ." Sir Charles himself: "ASSUMING that a similar rate of the conversion of water into land prevailed antecedently. . . ." And yet we are expected to accept the conclusions from all this

³⁵ "The Antiquity of Man; an Examination of Sir Charles Lyell's recent Work. By S. R. Pattison, F.G.S. London: Reeve, 1863."

To verify the quotation see Sir

Charles Lyell's "Principles," 7th Ed., 1847: ch. xlvi., p. 698.

³⁶ Ibid., p. 7.

³⁷ See Worsaae more at large in Mr. Pattison's "Examination."

assumption as unquestioningly as if it were so much demonstration!

Fourthly: Besides all this, we have been favoured with a real demonstration: not indeed of the warrantability of these assumptions, but of their worthlessness. Noticing the ancient canoes dug up from beneath the streets of Glasgow, Sir Charles³⁸ had assigned some of them to the stone period; (i.e., an antiquity of from 5000 to 7000 years;) but this statement had scarcely been published a month when Professor William King showed most conclusively "that the Glasgow canoes, instead of being 'several thousand years' old, are comparatively modern; the one containing the cork plug having probably been in use in the first or second century."

III. The burnt bricks found in the Nile mud. If, as Sir Charles truly says,

1. Mr. Horner's "conclusion is very vague and founded on insufficient data;"

2. Why is it adduced?

3. Why does Sir Charles pass so silently over the wonderful discovery, announced to the British Association in 1858, of a piece of pottery brought up in these borings, which Mr. Horner deemed to be 13,371 years old; but which has since been perceived to be of Mahomedan manufacture?

IV. The fossil human remains.

1. The age of the "calcareous conglomerate" is "SUPPOSED by Agassiz."

2. What the supposition is worth may be judged from the "fossil man of Guadalupe" discovered some years since in the same seas, embedded in a solid mass of limestone, and yet now universally admitted to be not more than about 150 years old. For aught that appears to the contrary, these Florida fossils are of the same date, the relics of a boat wreck occurring within the last few centuries.³⁹

³⁸ At p. 49 of his work.

³⁹ "The *Thetis* was sunk in 20 fathoms water near Rio-de-Janeiro. In a few weeks, when examined by the diving-bell, the sand, wood

and iron, and gold and silver coins, were found to be compressed into solid masses of rock, not to be broken without great difficulty."

3. No one dares to rest the case on any of these remains. The finding chiefly relied on is that of the flint implements.

4. To none does Sir Charles assign a higher antiquity than to those of Liége: i.e. in fact, the antiquity of the flints found there.

V. What then is the actual age denoted when we are told "that the flint tools and their fabricators were coeval with the extinct mammalia embedded in the same strata?"⁴⁰ What is the age of the "antediluvian" "Celts?" let us frankly confess "We do not know." Can Sir Charles tell us? He has not done so. One thing we do know, however; and that is the wide difference between the object proposed and the end attained. It is proposed to show that the antiquity of the human race is greater than the chronology of Scripture will allow;⁴¹ but what is accomplished is merely to show "the former co-existence of man with certain extinct mammalia." As if the two things were identical: whereas nothing can be further from the truth.

For what is decided by the mere word "extinct?" If all animals now extinct must have been extinct for at least 20,000 years, *that* fact would at least give us a fulcrum, on which our reasonings might rest. But we all know that "extinct" means nothing of the kind.

The Dodo and the Solitaire were large birds found in great numbers in Mauritius in the seventeenth century. They are now extinct. The Moa, a large bird of New Zealand has similarly disappeared. The Bison of Europe was once abundant, but is now confined to the forests of Lithuania. The Urus described by Cæsar, is now quite extinct. The American Buffalo formerly covered the eastern part of that continent to the Atlantic; it is now never seen east of the Missouri. Thus the progress of the human race naturally tends to the extermination of the larger kinds of wild animals. The practical conclusion, therefore, to which we are brought on this part of the question, is merely that to which two of the first geologists now living have given in

⁴⁰ Sir C. Lyell: p. 96.

⁴¹ Ib. pp. 1, 386. "A vast series of antecedent ages."

their adhesion: a conclusion very different from the one proposed. The *Westminster Review*, with evident vexation, is obliged to report, that the "discovery of flint implements, and other traces of the presence of man, associated with remains of creatures extinct long before the historical period, is admitted by Professor Dana as conclusive with regard to the contemporaneity of man with those animals; but he seems to adopt Mr. Prestwich's opinion, that this does not so much carry back the date of man, as bring forward that of the great mammals."⁴²

VI. On the whole then, we are compelled to adopt the conclusion of Mr. Pattison who, as a believer in Holy Scripture, and yet a geologist, observes that "There is nothing in the ascertained facts of geology, nothing in the exhaustive volume before us, to forbid the hypothesis that at some period after the final retreat of the glaciers, man found his way into these regions that many of the great mammals became extinct, some so lately as the mammoth, whose flesh was found in ice at the mouth of the Neva. For upwards of 4000 years all things were in course of becoming what they now are; and what they so became they have remained, save surface accumulations and minor changes, for the last 2000 years and upwards. For aught that geology or palaeontology has yet to shew, this is as valid an explanation of the phenomena as that which, under the semblance of indefiniteness, is carefully definite for a long time before Adam. If it is physically and philosophically possible to intercalate all the epochs of man, shown in the monuments of the globe itself, within the compass of the years assigned to the same occurrences by the received interpretation of Scripture, my task is done. I claim the verdict of 'Not proven' on the issue raised."

To this, may not unsuitably be added, the noble confession of Hugh Miller, himself as ardent a student of geology as ever existed:—"Geology furnishes us with no clue by which to unravel the unapproachable mysteries of creation; these mysteries belong to the wondrous Creator, and to Him only. We attempt to theorize upon them, and to reduce them to law,

⁴² *Westminster Review*; April 1863, p. 582.

and all nature rises up against us in our presumptuous rebellion. A stray splinter of cone-bearing wood,—a fish's tooth or skull,—the vertebra of a reptile,—the humerus of a bird,—the jaw of a quadruped,—all,—any of these things, weak and insignificant as they may seem, become, in such a quarrel, too strong for us and our theory ;—the puny fragment in the grasp of truth forms as irresistible a weapon as the dry bone did in that of Samson of old ; and our slaughtered sophisms lie piled up, 'heaps upon heaps' before it.”⁴³

⁴³ Hugh Miller's “Footprints of the Creator,” p. 313.

CHAPTER VIII.

SCRIPTURE AND SCIENCE (Continued).

"Equally indeterminate are those inferences concerning the length of time during which man may have existed on the earth, which are based on the few, and as yet insufficiently examined, cases of the discovery of the remains or works of men, in bone-caves, gravel-beds, and other superficial deposits. They belong to the latest period of which geology takes cognizance; they are comparatively modern; but we can apply no sure computation to them, founded on the geological evidence."—PROF. PHILLIPS.¹

THE conclusion at which we have thus arrived is irresistible. The projected triumph over the Bible must be postponed. The more carefully we survey this last attack upon the authenticity of the Inspired Record, the more clearly does its true character appear. It is a signal failure. The assailant retires discomfited: and the fierceness of the assault serves but to show the firmness of the foundations on which we have built our faith.

And yet, with what a flourish of trumpets was this assault commenced! The language of one of our most popular periodicals, in its very first number, upwards of four years ago, may be taken as a fair specimen:—

"The question of the antiquity of the human race is one which, on many grounds, has excited a lively interest, and has been an infallible provocative of controversy. Theologians of a narrow and too literal school have refused to entertain a suspicion that our ancestors could have peopled the globe longer than the prescribed 6,000 years; while the equally narrow and prejudiced ultra-sceptics have eagerly seized upon the most trifling and insufficiently authenticated statements as evidence

¹ Letter to the Provost of Worcester College, June 11, 1861.

of the vast antiquity of Man. In the mean time, Science, crying 'A plague on both your houses,' has taken her even course, and with suspended judgment, waited for the decisive facts which time was sure to bring under her ken. Such facts have seemed to present themselves over and over again. To say nothing of the "*Homo diluvii testis*" of the Tertiary schists of Oeningen, which turned out to be a great salamander; or of the fossil man of Guadaloupe, whom everybody has seen in the British Museum, and who is quite a modern petrifaction; we have had before us the woman of the Paviland Caves made famous by Buckland, the Indian skull said by Nott and Gliddon to be found under the remains of the twelve successive cypress forests near New Orleans, and a vast number of supposed discoveries of human bones and pottery and works of art associated with extinct animals, in Belgium, Germany, and France.

"Few of these cases, however, have been able to stand a searching investigation.² Besides cooking, and wearing pockets, man is distinguished by being a burying animal; and this peculiarity interferes a good deal with those geological reasonings which might otherwise be based upon the association of his remains with those of extinct animals, in caves and in superficial deposits suitable for sepulture. So long, in fact, as such instances of association were few and far between, it was the wiser course to admit the possibility of the mixture being accidental. But some recent discoveries have completely changed the face of the whole question, by proving that implements which, with our present knowledge, we can only suppose to be of human manufacture, are found inseparably mixed up with the remains of mammoths and other extinct animals over a wide geographical area, in great abundance, and

²The same may now be said of the most recent instance—the one half of a human jaw found at Moulin Quignon, and extracted under the eyes of M. de Perthes himself. In a letter to the "Times" of April 25th, Dr. Falconer declared that M. de Perthes had been deceived by the

workmen. And although the idea of fraud was repudiated by others, the most eminent physiologists (e.g. M. Milne Edwards, and M. de Quatrefages) expressly held themselves uncommitted to any opinion as to the geological age of the Moulin Quignon beds.

under conditions which preclude the possibility of their having been buried where we find them.”³

Two or three things are here particularly noteworthy. Those who impeach “the prescribed 6,000 years,” are suddenly become so sanguine of success in the future, that they candidly admit the failure of their attempts in the past. The facts heretofore adduced to prove their theories (i.e. to disprove “the prescribed 6,000 years”) have only “seemed” to do so. But they have the “decisive facts” at last. For “some recent discoveries have completely changed the face of the whole question.” Changed it, we are further told, by excluding the consideration of those cases in which human remains are associated “with those of extinct animals, in caves, and in superficial deposits suitable for sepulture;” and by directing us to those other “conditions which preclude the possibility of their having been buried where we find them.”

This surrender of the cave deposits materially simplifies the question at issue. For it is the surrender of Dr Schmerling’s discoveries on the banks of the Meuse; of MM. Marcel de Serres and Tournal’s in the cavern of Bize; of M. de Christol’s at Poudres and Souvignargues; of M. de Vibraye’s near Arcy; as well as of the eight hundred South American caves ransacked by the indefatigable naturalists Lund and Clausen, amongst all which, however, they found but one solitary instance in which human bones were “so mixed with those of extinct animals, as to suggest that the two had been contemporaneous.”⁴

It is the surrender too, of the famous cave at Brixham, notwithstanding all the care with which its contents were disinterred; of the Maccagnone cavern described by the same ardent discoverer, Dr. Falconer; of the two neighbouring caves explored by his associate, the Baron de Mangalaviti; and of the limestone cavern in Languedoc, examined by M. A. Fontan. For it is not easy to see the consistency with which, while cave deposits are abandoned, any of these can be retained.

The argument for the high antiquity of man is thus made to

³ *Once a Week*: vol. i. p. 3. Art. “Man among the Mammoths.” ⁴ *Quarterly Journal of the Geo-* logical Society. vol. vii (1851). Lyell’s Presidential Address: pp. 71, 72.

depend on the findings in other places than caves. That is to say, on the discoveries of works of art, chiefly flint instruments, associated with the remains of extinct animals in places where we have no reason to suppose they were buried. Such places are the sands of the Parisian suburb of Grenelle; the drift in the neighbourhood of Chatillon-sur-Seine; and the spots noted for similar findings, in the valley of the Oise, in the canton of Berne, in the Isle of Man, in Suffolk (near Hoxne and Icklingham), in Kent (near the Reculvers and Whitstable), in Bedfordshire (near the county town), in Surrey (at Peasemarsh), and at Abbot Langley in Hertfordshire. Few however, if any, of the findings in these cases are exempt from attendant circumstances which render them, for the purpose of argument, altogether inconclusive. The basis of the argument is therefore further narrowed to the discoveries in the valley of the Somme; at St. Acheul near Amiens, at St. Roch near St. Acheul, and at Menchecourt, a suburb of Abbeville. It is in these "recent discoveries" that we have, at last, the "decisive facts" which "have completely changed the face of the whole question."

But at this point two questions arise. First: Are these "decisive facts" facts at all? Are they not mere fabrications or frauds? Second: Admitting the alleged facts as actual, are they decisive?

To the first of these questions we answer with an unhesitating "Yes;" to the second, Truth compels us to say "No."

When it is alleged that the flint implements, believed to have been fashioned by man, have been found at certain specified places, and under certain specified circumstances, we do not forget the frauds admitted to have been practised by quarrymen and mercenary dealers, but still less do we forget that in the most important cases there is scientific testimony worthy of all credit. We accept that testimony, and admit the finding as undeniably true.

We admit, too, the further allegation that the flint implements believed to have been fashioned by man, have really been so fashioned. We make this admission, not forgetting the statement made before the British Association at Aberdeen in 1859, that these flint implements so far from being unmistakeably what they were called, were submitted by the geologists to

the antiquaries for a positive opinion on this point ; not forgetting that, later still, a distinguished *expert* "thought it not impossible that mechanical or molecular forces might have caused their contour by splintering and chipping the natural flint nodules while undergoing movements among each other ;" nor forgetting that, after the adhesion of so many great names to the opposite opinion, another geologist could write thus :— "While thus very decidedly leaning to the view that the so-called implements were fashioned by man, we repeat, that the last shade of doubt has not yet been removed from the subject." On the other hand however, we possess the candid and concurrent testimony of some of the most eminent geologists and archæologists of our times,⁵ who although sceptical at first, have at last become completely convinced that these flints owe their distinctive shapes to the agency of man.

But when we have thus admitted the finding of these flint-implements in the strata and under the circumstances specified ; and when further we have fully admitted the configuration of these implements to be of human workmanship, and not the result of physical agencies :—we are at the end of our admissions.

Granted, that flint implements are found ; and that, associated with them in the same deposit, the bones of extinct quadrupeds are also found. Does the mere association in the same deposit prove that the artificers of the implements and the extinct animals cœxisted in time ?

It does not prove it. The fact of the association is fully admitted ; but that this fact is at all "decisive" is utterly denied.⁶

⁵ For instance : Alexander Brongniart, Rigollet, Gaudry, Ponteux and De Sauley among the French ; and the highly authoritative names of Sir Charles Lyell, J. Prestwich, Godwin Austin, W. Milne, J. W. Flower, and J. Evans, among ourselves.

⁶ The contemporaneity of the relies of man and those of the

lower animals was denied not only by Cuvier and Dr. Buckland, but by Sir Charles Lyell himself, as lately as the last edition of his "Principles." He had there said, (after enumerating the sources of confusion in classifying cave deposits,) "It is not on such evidence that we shall readily be induced to admit either the high antiquity

Did the race of savage men who made these rude flint hatchets roam the same forests, bathe in the same waters, and breathe the same air with the extinct mammoth or elephant, rhinoceros, hippopotamus, bos, horse, and other primeval quadrupeds whose fossilized teeth and bones are held by geologists to have been entombed as long ago as the last great revolution of the surface, which overspread it with the Diluvium or drift? Or did the men, (notwithstanding the association of the "flints" and bones) live after the extinction of those large races, tenants of the same region with an altered surface, until *they, the men*, in their turn, were overtaken by an inundation, or a diluvium that obliterated that surface, and buried its most enduring objects within the stratum on which they rested? Our opponents affirm the first of these suppositions to be the true one; but to this affirmation we object that it is merely conjectural and utterly unsupported by proof. The mere semblance of proof indeed is found in the few and feeble statements of those who profess themselves unable to discover any "signs of the disturbance and rearrangement of the beds," but have found the flint knives unblunted, "which could not have happened had they been rolled." Thus, M. Gaudry, detailing his proceedings at St. Acheul, says "One may easily be satisfied that the gravel beds are in their normal state, and that they have not been *remaniés* [rearranged] by man." This opinion is supported by Professor Phillips in such a way as to destroy it. For in giving an abstract of the statements made by those who had visited Amiens, that authority mentions that the gravel is believed to have been shifted along with the flint implements a little way; but that it has not moved far, is thought to be proved by the fact that the cutting edge of the implements is

of the human race, or the recent date of certain lost species of quadrupeds."

Now, however, in the "Antiquity of Man," while candidly acknowledging his former opinion, he thus alters it:—

"But of late years we have obtained convincing proofs . . .

that the mammoth and many other extinct mammalian species very common in caves, occur also in undisturbed alluvium, embedded in such a manner with works of art, as to leave no room for doubt that Man and the mammoth co-existed." (p. 62.)

still unworn and unblunted.⁷ Now, our objection to this is, that it is mere opinion; and opinion too, opposed to fact. We by no means deny that it is possible to find a few flints with edges comparatively unblunted, but then these few exceptions, by their very exceptional character, serve but to prove the rule.⁸ What that rule is cannot be better stated than in the words of one of the most candid as well as one of the most able writers who has yet discussed the subject. Describing, after careful observation, the deposit enclosing the worked flints and the bones, he says the materials present "all the signs of having been irregularly strewn and rudely deposited—indeed, all the usually admitted indications of *turbulent diluvial action*.

"The upper beds of the chalk formation on which they rest, have been torn up and broken into a fragmentary mass or rubble, a mixture of rolled lumps of chalk, and unabraded nodules of chalk flint. The surface of the chalk is uneven, with shallow troughs and basins hollowed in it, as by a passing erosive flood, moving with a strong eddying current. The diluvial deposit itself consists of coarse and fine gravel and sand, rolled flints, and subangular fragments of all sizes compatible with the material, and in well-laminated parallel beds, not *sorted*, as it inevitably would be had the watery current been a steady or equable one of moderate force and prolonged duration, but promiscuously intermixed, in imperfectly discernible, short, tapering, and abruptly truncated oblique layers, dipping and abutting at high angles among themselves, and inclining towards nearly all the points of the compass, and at angles as steep to the horizon as 30 or even 40 degrees—features all of them implying a violent and transient surge.

"As if to offer us still more unequivocal proof of the energy of the transporting current, this wildly-tossed gravel contains scattered boulders, or masses of a ponderous compact sandstone, supposed to be of Eocene age, of dimensions varying from a foot in diameter to a superficies of three feet in breadth, with

⁷ Prof. Phillips' Presidential Address: Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society vol. xvi., pp. 52—55.

⁸ See Note A in the Appendix, for the explanation of the manner in which these exceptions prove the rule.

the same thickness, the larger ones weighing about half a ton. These blocks of sandstone are, moreover, all more or less abraded and rounded at their edges and corners, evincing how roughly they have been bouldered. In these conditions they are numerous around Amiens, especially at St. Acheul, St. Roque, and Montier. The upper surface of the gravel is still more undulating than the lower, even to the extent of exposing in profile some singularly sharp grooves and ridges ; and, what is of especial significance, the rude layers within the deposit follow imperfectly these undulations of the upper boundary.

“To all these marks of diluvial action must be added those presented by the fossil bones and teeth, and by the flint-implements, very few of which latter are destitute of traces, more or less obvious, of attrition with the gravel, while many of them have been observed by M. de Perthes to be so much rubbed down as to retain but faintly the features of works of human art.”

The candour, not less than the certainty, of the conclusion drawn from these premises, demands that it should be quoted entire :—

“The argument which we would erect upon all these manifest indications of turbulent action in the waters which left this very promiscuous deposit, is, that by pointing to an agency—an incursion, we mean, of the by no means distant ocean—perfectly capable of invading the dry land within historic time, and mixing up its more recent surface objects with previously buried relics of an earlier or prehistoric epoch, we are debarred from assuming that the two classes of monuments were coeval, and that from the imputed age of the one we can infer the antiquity of the other. This is what those do who view all the surface drifts as but one formation, pointing to but one date, calling it the Diluvium. We pray the reader to observe, that it is far from our meaning here, that we can *disprove* the contemporaneousness of the flint shaping men and the great antediluvian quadrupeds. We only assert—but assert confidently—that the phenomena utterly fail to *prove* it. The burden of the case is with those who, treating the Diluvium as one and indivisible in mode of formation and in date, accept the mere fact of present association in it as evidence of coexistence

in time. If, therefore, it can be shewn on an interpretation of the geology, in accordance with sound physical principles, that a redressing of the deposit *may* have taken place, the verdict must be that this *coexistence in time* is NOT ESTABLISHED ; and the antediluvian antiquity of man must be cast out of the high court of science with a verdict of NOT PROVEN.”⁹

But admitting (for the moment) that the wrought flints are truly cotemporary with the animals whose bones lie side by side with them ; and further admitting that the deposit embedding both is the general Diluvium or mammalian drift ;¹⁰ do these facts determine the flints to have been fashioned in an age preceding the usually assigned date of the birth of man ? Logically, it must be conceded, they do not : for independent of the absence or presence of these or other vestiges of man in the Diluvium, *its* antiquity, or relation to historic time, is obviously not ascertainable. Apart from human relics in, or over, or under, the drift, how can we link it on to human time at all ? Before the discovery of flint-implements in this superficial formation, or so long as the traces of men were known only in deposits *later* that the Diluvium, it was deemed to belong to an age antecedent to the creation of man, and had on

⁹ Blackwood’s Maga. vol. lxxxviii, pp. 429—430. Art. “ The Reputed Traces of Primeval Man.”

¹⁰ This admission however, though fundamentally essential to the antiquity alleged by the theorists is utterly refused by one of the most eminent geologists living. M. Elie de Beaumont has decided that the Moulin Quignon beds are not “ diluvium ;” they are not even alluvia deposited by the encroachment of rivers on their banks ; but are simply composed of washed soil deposited on the flanks of the valley by excessive falls of rain, such as may be supposed to occur ex-

ceptionally once or twice in a thousand years.

This statement coming from such a high authority is said by the cotemporary reports to have “ produced an unusual and almost electric sensation on the scientific auditory.” Notwithstanding this however, a week later this eminent geologist reiterated his opinion in the same illustrious assembly, adding, that the age of these formations belonged, in his opinion, to the “ stone period,” or is analogous to that of peat mosses and the Swiss “ lake habitations.”

that very account a relatively high antiquity assigned to it; but now, granting that relics of men have been found buried in it, is it sound reasoning to infer for these relics the very antiquity which was only attributable to the Diluvium because it was believed to be *destitute* of all such human vestiges?

Since the days of the illustrious Cuvier, the Diluvium of geologists has always been regarded as something very ancient, simply because he and his successors, finding it replete with the remains of huge land mammals no longer living, never succeeded in detecting in it a solitary bone or tooth of a human being, nor indeed anything indicative of man's existence; but now, in finding things indicative of man, we have lost the warrant for this supposed antiquity. As matters now stand, it is as rational to infer the relative recency of the extinct *Elephas primigenius* and the other mammals of the Diluvium, from the co-existence of the works of men with them, on the ground that the human is a living and a modern race, as it is to deduce the antiquity of man from the once erroneously assumed greater age of those animals. In the words of the authority already freely quoted, "I would repeat, then, that a specially remote age is not attributable to the flint-carving men of the Diluvium, simply because it is the Diluvium or Mammoth embedding gravel which contains them."¹¹

This point then is also settled. But, still admitting (for the moment) the true cotemporaneity of these relics of man and the mammoth, another question remains. May not the high antiquity of the flints be inferred from that of the mammalian bones in the same deposit?

The answer is evident. The high antiquity "may be" inferred—and until lately it has been inferred—but, as the ascertained facts now indicate, it has been inferred falsely. The true inference from this association appears to be this,—not that man is more ancient than was previously known, but that the mammoths are more modern than was previously supposed. This is the inference sustained by the constant accumulation of facts.

¹¹ Blackwood's Maga. p. 431.

With respect to the *Colossochelys Atlas*,¹² whose cessation of existence has been carefully discussed by its discoverers, Dr. Falconer and Major Cauntley, those gentlemen have come to the conclusion "that there are fair grounds for entertaining the belief, as probable, that the *Colossochelys Atlas* may have lived down to an early period of the human epoch, and become extinct since." The mammoth¹³ or hairy elephant of Siberia (*elephas primigenius*) must have perished at a very recent date, for, as is well known, a specimen with the flesh still in such a state as to furnish food for dogs and other animals in the vicinity, was found preserved in ice and frozen soil at the mouth of the Lena in 1799. The Siberian rhinoceros (*Rhinoceros tichorhinus*) had been found in the frozen gravelly soil of the Wilhuji, an affluent of the Lena, nearly thirty years before.¹⁴ Those two huge Pachyderms are certainly extinct now; yet their remains, scattered over so vast an area, are everywhere associated with those of other animals which were indubitably cotemporary with them, and whose species-life is continued to our own times. The remains of the great Mastodon occur in greatest abundance in North America; and the specimens found along the Great Osage River, in Illinois, and in Virginia, furnish abundant reason for concluding that the period of its de-

¹² *Colossochelys Atlas*: the vast fossil land tortoise of the Sewalik hills, in the north of India, whose carapace may have covered an area of twelve or fifteen feet in diameter, and whose entire length, as in walking, when head and tail were protruded, could not have been less than thirty feet.

¹³ Some idea of its size may be conceived from the fact that its two tusks weighed "three hundred and sixty pounds, English weight, and the head alone four hundred and fourteen pounds. A most interesting account of the discovery was furnished by Mr. Adams, Associate of the

Academy of St. Petersburg, who visited the scene in the service of the Imperial Court. (See "On the Mammoth or Fossil Elephant, &c." London, 1819.) A part of the skin, and some of the hair of this animal were sent by Mr. Adams to Sir Joseph Banks, who presented them to the Museum of the Royal College of Surgeons, where they are still preserved.

¹⁴ It was twelve feet in length. The remains of the brain were still in the cavity of the skull, and the flesh of the body, in a putrefying condition, was still beneath the skin.

cease is not indefinitely removed from our own era. Among several of the aboriginal tribes of Red men there were extant traditions of the Mastodon as a living creature. With respect to the great extinct Mammalia of South America, we find Mr. Darwin, to whom we are indebted for our knowledge of so many of them, continually expressing his wonder at the comparatively modern era of their existence. Of the remains of the Mylodon, and of that strange semi-aquatic creature the Toxodon, he says, they appeared so fresh that it was difficult to believe they had lain buried for ages under ground. "The bones were so fresh, that they yielded, on careful analysis, seven per cent. of animal matter, and when heated in the flame of a spirit lamp, they not only exhaled a very strong animal odour, but actually burned with a small flame." "The whole plain of South America, from the Rio Plata to the Straits of Magellan, has been raised from the sea within the species-life of the existing sea-shells, the old and weathered specimens of which, left on the surface of the plain, still partially retain their colours! Darwin infers, as certain, from data which he has adduced, that the Macrauchen, that strange giraffe-necked pachyderm, lived *long after* the sea was inhabited by its present shells, and when the vegetation of the land could not have been other than it is now. And if the Macrauchen, then the Toxodon, the Scelidotherium, the Megatherium, the Mylodon, the Glyptodon, the Glossotherium, and all the rest of the quaint but mighty host of gone giants, that once thronged these austral plains."¹⁵ Evidence for the recent existence of the colossal ostrich-like birds of New Zealand—the Dinornis, Palapteryx, and Notornis—is stronger still. Everybody knows of the recent extinction of the Dodo, which but two centuries since existed in considerable abundance, in the isles of Mauritius, Bourbon, and Rodriguez. The *Cheiromys*, (the link connecting the monkey with the squirrel) has disappeared from Madagascar, and the huge marine pachyderm *Stelleria* from Behring's Straits, within the last century. We have the most abundant evidence that the Giant Deer (*Megaceros Hibernicus*) was an inhabitant of Ireland since its colonization by man. One of our most distinguished natur-

¹⁵ Gosse: Romance of Nat. Hist. 2nd Series; p. 33.

alists¹⁶ considers it "certain that the vast *Bos primigenius* of Western Europe lived as a wild animal cotemporaneously with man;" and as but little less certain, since its identification with the *Urus* of Cæsar, "that it continued to be abundant as late as the Christian era." Its cotemporary, the *Bison Europæus*, still survives. But this *Bison Europæus*, of modern zoology, the most massive of all existing quadrupeds, after the great Pachyderms, is considered absolutely identical with the *Bison priscus* which roamed over Germany in some numbers as late as the era of Charlemagne; and whose fossil remains are now found in many parts of Europe. Illustrations of the process of extinction are occurring continually. The Moho and the Kāureke of New Zealand, the *Manu-meā* (*Didunculus strigirostris*) of the Samoa Isles in the Pacific, and the *Nestor productus* of Norfolk Island, have all disappeared in our own day. "It is only within the last hundred years that we have had anything approaching to an acquaintance with the living fauna of the earth; yet during that time some seven or eight creatures we know have been extinguished. Fully half of these,—the Auk, the *Didunculus*, the *Notornis*, and the *Nestor*,—within the last ten years!" And why should this process of gradual extinction—incessant as it is, and inevitable as it appears—excite surprise? "To admit," says Mr. Darwin, "that species generally become rare before they become extinct—to feel no surprise at the comparative rarity of one species with another, and yet to call in some extraordinary agent, and to marvel greatly when a species ceases to exist, appears to me much the same as to admit that sickness in the individual is the prelude of death—to feel no surprise at sickness—but when the sick man dies to wonder, and to believe that he died through violence."¹⁷ But whatever may be the causes of the phenomenon in general, this particular fact is certain;—that the assumption of a high (pre-Adamic) antiquity for the Mammoths of the Diluvium, is an assumption not only unsupported by evidence, but one to which all the ascertainable evidence stands directly opposed.

Closely connected with this topic, but yet quite distinct from

¹⁶ P. H. Gosse. (*O si sic Omnes!*)

¹⁷ Nat. Voyage, ch. 8.

it, is another which demands our notice. It is the consideration of those physical changes which the structures of those antediluvian animals, as they have been styled, are supposed to imply.¹⁸ Their generic relationships are believed to betoken conditions in the physical geography and climate of the regions they traversed, widely dissimilar from those now prevailing. Climate is confessedly a most potent element in the geographical distribution of animal types; but the special significance of the extinction now under consideration consists in its pointing to features of physical geography now obliterated from the regions which the extinct animals occupied. It is this consideration principally which implies antiquity in intimating extensive and thorough changes in the distribution of the dry lands and waters, the dominant winds, the vegetation, and indeed in all the physical conditions upon which depend the whole complex balance of organic life, changes which, unfitting a country for its earlier denizens, slowly and even imperceptibly adapt it to a later fauna. What then is the extent of that antiquity, implied by the former physical geography, indicated by these organic remains?

For anything approaching a definite answer to this simple query, the data are altogether too indeterminate. It is therefore no wonder that the geologists themselves are pretty equally divided in favor of opposite conclusions. To suppose however, that the antiquity thus implied must be so great as to be prehistoric, is to suppose what cannot be proved. The ascertained facts go to prove the very contrary. In our own island, the fossil bull was cotemporary with the elephant, and the hyena, and the baboon, and, strange to say, with the reindeer, and the musk-ox, too: thus combining a tropical, a temperate, and an arctic fauna in our limited island at the same period! We are

¹⁸ Thus, e.g. In the course of an address to the Royal Society of Edinbro' the Duke of Argyle observes with reference to the relics of Man in the valley of the Somme, that "The reluctance to admit the contemporaneity of Man with those animals [extinct mammalia] results

from the reluctance to admit Man's priority to such physical changes as are supposed to separate us from a fauna typified by the mammoth and the elk."—

Proceedings of the Royal Society, Edinbro': Dec. 3rd, 1860. p. 363.

debarred therefore, from assuming that a particular extinct species must have been suited to climatal conditions similar to those with which living species of the same genus are now in harmonious adjustment.¹⁹ On the other hand, there are not lacking indications that the climatal conditions of those days have been less altered than is commonly supposed. "The great bear and the musk-ox of the sub-polar regions, we know to be in the habit of migrating northward in spring, and southward in autumn. That no lack of suitable food would be found, even in such high latitudes, for browsing quadrupeds, appears from the fact that, even beyond the parallel of 75° north, large birch trees are found embedded in the cliffs, in abundance sufficient to be largely used as common fuel, and still retaining their woody fibre, their bark, branches, and roots. The climate then was not *greatly* different from what it is now, when the birch, as a tree, reaches to about 70°."²⁰

The last question yet remains: and it is intimately associated with the preceding. How far can we infer a great antiquity to these earliest records of mankind (the worked flints,) from the nature of the containing and overlying sedimentary deposits?

Here again, as in every other attempt to interrogate Geology upon the subject of Time, her response is Sybilline. "She has two classes of votaries; one entitled the *Uniformitarian* school, or *Quietists*, who, interpreting the past changes in the earth's surface by the natural forces, especially the gentler ones, now in operation, overlook the more energetic and promptly acting ones; and another, the school of the *Catastrophists*, perhaps more fitly defined the *Paroxysmists*, who, blind in the opposite eye, see only the most vehement energies of nature,—the earthquake and the inundation,—and take no account of the softer but unceasingly efficient agencies which gradually depress or lift the land, or silently erode and reconstruct it. By each of these, her answers as to Time are *differently inter-*

¹⁹ The Indian lion has been found alive in the Asiatic continent, as far north as latitude 52°; that is to the north of London, and

in a winter climate incomparably more severe.

²⁰ Romance of Nat. Hist. 2nd Series: p. 24.

preted : the Quietist translates them in terms of gentle change, involving enormous time ; whilst the Paroxysmist reads in them expressions of violent and sudden mutations, only compatible with altogether briefer periods.”²¹ In the present instance, while fully admitting the partial operation of the more silent and gradual changes, we shall content ourselves with pointing out some of the manifest and manifold indications that violent and sudden mutations have been the causes specially employed in producing the nature and the structure of these deposits.

The embedding stratum of the worked flints—for Abbeville, Amiens, and the other localities on the Somme—is a rudely-deposited, irregularly strewn bed of somewhat fragmentary chalk-flint, containing some flint sand, a little pulverised chalk, and occasional large blocks or boulders, of a hard quartzose Eocene sandstone.

This “evidently diluvial matrix” rests directly on a somewhat uneven and eroded floor of chalk. It is overlaid in its turn by no less than three other strata of aqueous origin, but all formed under dissimilar conditions.

First above the bone and hatchet entombing gravel (and therefore second above the floor of chalk) lies a greyish white and brownish sand, embedding several species of fresh water and terrestrial shells, identical with species now living in this part of the globe.

Third in ascending order above the chalk occurs a second gravel, composed exclusively of chalk flints in a rolled and more or less fractured condition. This bed, varying in thickness at St. Acheul from two to five feet, exhibits conspicuously at this locality the marks of having been deposited or pushed along in very turbulent waters ; for its lower boundary, beheld in section at the gravel pits, shows a succession of sharply-conical, and somewhat spiral, deep depressions in the upper surface of the sand beneath it, identical in every feature with the funnel-shaped pits bored by any strong, swiftly-eddying current in a yielding bottom of mud or sand.

Fourth, and uppermost in the series of loose beds, is a brown

²¹ Blackwood’s Maga. vol. lxxxviii. p. 432.

brick-earth, or ferruginous sandy clay or loam, interspersed with numerous small splinters of chalk flint, but like the torrential gravel on which it rests, destitute not only of mammalian organic remains, but also of the curious instruments in flint associated with them in the lowermost of the four superficial deposits.

Reviewing these particulars, who does not see how impossible it is to account for them on the "quietest" principles of the Uniformitarian school? The blocks of sandstone, at any rate, could not have been conveyed to their present resting-places by any known force of water short of that which it derives from the vehement internal heavings of the earth's crust. No agency of ice is here admissible: the bones of the rhinoceros, elephant, and hippopotamus, point not to a colder, but to a warmer climate than that now prevailing. But besides the presence of these sandstone blocks, and besides the marks of severe abrasion which they so indisputably bear, we have the fact that this deposit is spread broadcast over all the valleys of the Somme, from beneath the peaty meadows which bound the river, up the gently ascending slopes of this wide shallow trench in the land, to the summits of the plateaus which determine the existing drainage; distributed diffusely, too, and not in terraces, such as might denote oscillations in the relative levels of land and sea.

By what processes of slow deposition, erosion and elevation, are these phenomena to be explained? Certainly by none that go beyond mere hypothesis. On the supposition of the agency of subterranean forces, the solution of the various phenomena is complete and entire: but on the opposite supposition of the Uniformitarian school, the phenomena remain unsolved.

The mention of this fact leads to another. Not only are the principles of this (the Uniformitarian) school inadequate to the solution of the phenomena which they are adduced to explain; but they are so frequently abandoned by their own advocates as to destroy all confidence in their correctness. Thus, for instance, the difficulty (on their principles) of accounting for such changes as must have occurred at Brixham, and in the valley of the Meuse, startles even Sir Chs. Lyell himself from his uniformi-

tarian tranquillity. "It may be objected," says he, "that according to the present rate of change, *no lapse of ages would suffice* to bring about such revolutions in physical geography as we are here contemplating. *This may be true. It is more than probable that the rate of change was once far more active than it is now.*"²² Who does not see that the last sentence annihilates the argument for excessive antiquity—surrenders the cause which the advocate undertook to plead, and puts the claimant out of court! This inconsistency "reminds us of the practice of those homœopathic professors who, whilst no crisis threatens, continue to administer with firm composure trillionths of a grain to their trusting patient; but when emergencies occur, lose confidence in their globules, and resort with precipitation to the vigorous remedies of the orthodox physician."²³

Nor is it only by this desertion in the face of danger, that the utter untrustworthiness of these principles is demonstrated. It is shown by their own intrinsic and evident absurdity. The longer we make the periods, in conformity with the Lyellian doctrines, the more plainly do we expose the excessive improbability of the Lyellian assumptions. To apply the deductions of 100 or 200 years' experience to the condition of the globe 200,000 or 300,000 years ago,²⁴ is nothing better than an abuse of logic and of the rules of evidence. As one of Sir C. Lyell's numerous critics happily suggests, it is "pretty much the same as if a man finding that an individual nearly six feet in height had grown only half an inch last year, were to conclude that he must be 140 years old." In the pregnant language of Dr. Whewell, "Time inexhaustible and ever accumulating his efficacy, can undoubtedly do much for the theorist in geology; but Force, whose limits we cannot measure, and whose nature we cannot fathom, is also a power never to be slighted; and to call in the one to protect us from the other, is equally presumptuous, to which ever of the two our superstition

²² Antiquity of Man, ch. iv, p. 74

²³ Ed. Rev., July 1863; p. 280.

²⁴ Mr. Darwin has had the temerity to estimate on similar

principles a period of 306,662,400 years! (Phillips' Address to Geological Society, 1860.)

leans.”²⁵ And the Coryphaeus of the uniformitarian school of Geology is himself forced to admit that rivers, such as the Thames for example, “could never, not even in millions of years, have excavated the valleys through which they flow.”²⁶

Again, Sir Roderick Murchison’s very able and very striking Paper on the “Drift of the South East of England” has put us in possession of a parallel case; a formation geographically and geologically the counterpart of that of the valley of the Somme. Now of this district Sir R. Murchison testified a dozen years ago, that the “flint-drift” was not the lingering deposit of ages of comparative repose, but bore witness to short though turbulent agencies, performing, probably, in a few years, the work for which the uniformitarian demands his hundreds or even thousands of centuries. After particularising the physical features which exactly correspond with those of the Menche-court and Moulin-quignon beds at Abbeville, he adds:—“A glance at any of these materials at once bespeaks the tumultuary nature of their origin, for none of them contained water-worn or rounded pebbles.”²⁸ And again: “By no imaginable process of the longest continued diurnal action could any portion of this detritus have been gradually derived during ages from the low chalk hills.”²⁹

If anything more were needed in condemnation of the unwarranted inferences, the exaggerated estimates, on which this most conjectural theory of the high Antiquity of Man is founded, it would be found in the weighty words addressed to the Geological Society by one of the most cautious and competent of its professors. Speaking from the chair of the Society, Professor Phillips forcibly asks,—

“Do not geologists sometimes speak with needless freedom of the ages that have gone? Such expressions as that ‘time

²⁵ History of Inductive Sciences: Book xviii, ch. 8.

It is added:—“We find in the analogy of the sciences no confirmation of the doctrine of uniformity, as it has been maintained in geology.

²⁶ Lyell's Principles of Geology: Ed. 1834; vol. i. p. 500.

²⁷ Journal of Geological Society (vii, pp. 349—398) 1851.

²⁸ Page 360.

²⁹ Page 368.

costs nature nothing,' appear to me no better than the phrase which ascribes to Nature 'the horror of a vacuum.' Are we to regard as information of value the assertion that millions on millions of ages have passed since the epoch of life in some of the earlier strata? Is not this abuse of arithmetic likely to lead to a low estimate of the evidence in support of such random conclusions, and of the uncritical judgment which so readily accepts them?"³⁰

³⁰Professor Phillips' Address to the Geological Society, February 17, 1860; p. 52.

CHAPTER IX.

SCRIPTURE AND SCIENCE (Concluded.)

"I believe, and am satisfied, that Geology has . . . established no results hostile to the evidences of Revelation."—PROF. PHILLIPS.¹

BY the facts now reviewed, the conclusion at which we had previously arrived is abundantly confirmed. The attempt to make out a pre-Adamic antiquity for Man has entirely failed. And no wonder. "Glancing at the work of Sir C. Lyell as a whole, it leaves the impression on our mind that we have been reading an ingenious academical Thesis, rather than a work of demonstration by an original writer who is firmly and of his own knowledge convinced of what he maintains."²

Yet its object, and its tendency are alike unmistakeable. "Natural curiosity is justly excited by the attempt to determine, from the records of physical change alone, the probable chronology of Man; and although the words 'Moses' or the 'Bible' never once occur in Sir C. Lyell's work, no reader can fail to see that the credit of both is held by the author to be in some measure at stake in this enquiry. It is thus by implication connected with subjects now agitating the public mind, though very wide of purely scientific debates. The consciousness of the prevailing current of thought on this subject, never exactly rising to the surface, leaves the reader with that uncomfortable amount of scepticism which loosens one set of ideas without giving a firm hold to any by which they can be replaced."³ In other words, without adducing a tittle of evidence

¹ In "Replies to Ess. and Rev." p. 516.

² Ed. Review. July 1863; p. 295.

³ Ib. 296.

in justification of positive disbelief, by implication and suggestion it surrounds the foundations of our faith with a surging sea of Doubt.

But the Lord sitteth above the water-floods ; and “the foundation standeth sure.” The Scripture cannot be broken ; and this last attempt to impair its integrity with the weapons of geology, though more pretentious, is not more powerful than the many failures by which it has been preceded. This is most fully admitted even by those who think that the common chronology is not strictly accurate, based as it is (in their opinion) upon a somewhat mistaken interpretation of the data furnished by Scripture. “We must confess,” say they,—and a most material confession it is:—“We must confess that we cannot detect in the pages of Sir C. Lyell any traces of a more stable and connected physical chronology” than that of Genesis. And again, reviewing the various discoveries now adduced in support of the theory of the pre-Adamic antiquity of man, and especially the findings in “the Aurignac cave,” with M. Lartel’s conclusions thereupon, the same authority adds that the result “goes a long way to convince us that the existence in Europe of the cave-bear, cave-lion, rhinoceros, and mammoth, must be approximated much more towards recent times, rather than that the creation of Man must be drawn back into regions of quite hypothetical remoteness, on account of his association with extinct species.”⁴ Thus confirming the sagacious conclusion at which Mr. Prestwich arrived more than four years ago. In a paper read before the Royal Society, May 26, 1859, concerning the deposit containing the flint-implements at Menchecourt, that gentleman says that “He does not, however, consider, that the facts of necessity carry man back in past time more than they bring forward the great extinct mammals towards our own time, the evidence having reference only to relative, and not to absolute time ; and he is of opinion that many of the later geological changes may have been sudden, or of shorter duration than generally considered. In fact, from the evidence here exhibited, and from all that he knows regarding the drift phenomena generally, the author sees no reason

⁴ Ib. p. 285.

against the conclusion that this period of man and the extinct mammals—supposing their contemporaneity to be proved—was brought to a sudden end by a temporary inundation of the land ; on the contrary, he sees much to support such a view on purely geological considerations.”⁵ It is unnecessary to observe how completely corroborative of Holy Scripture is this conclusion ; or how strongly it attests the validity of that first principle of all sound criticism—“ We can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth.”

Equally conjectural, not less inconclusive, and much more absurd, are the attempts which, with a like object, have been made by Baron Bunsen and his followers. This writer, less cautious than Sir Charles Lyell, does not hesitate to speak of Bible dates as “ Hebrew tradition,” and to tell us (of his own private information, of course,) that “ it is a settled point that that tradition, as it stands, contains no chronology whatever.”⁶ Again, a hundred pages farther on, he says, “ The ordinary chronology, then we declare to be devoid of any scientific foundation ; the interpretation indeed by which it is accompanied, when carefully investigated, makes the Bible a tissue of old woman’s stories and children’s tales, which contradict each other. When confronted with authentic chronology it generally leads to impossible results. . . . For it contradicts all reality, and necessitates the denial of facts which are as clear as the sun. . . . ”⁷

These be brave words. Like Falstaff’s bragging of the men in buckram, they need but the adjunct of brave deeds to make them respectable. But unfortunately for their credit, the deeds are not forthcoming. The words are loud enough : as loud as

⁵ Proceedings of the Royal Soc., X. xxxv. 50. And again :—“ The evidence has gone far to prove that man was cotemporaneous with certain animals now locally or universally extinct ; but has in our view, QUITE FAILED to shew that the period when those animals perished, was very remote

There is thus nothing yet proved inconsistent with the teaching of Holy Writ regarding the time of man’s creation.”—(Brit. and For. Ev. Review, for 1861 ; p. 904.)

⁶ Egypt’s Place in Universal History : vol. iii. p. 247.

⁷ Ibid. vol. iii, p. 348.

“ancient Pistol’s”—and as empty. In inverse proportion to the strength of the assertions is the weakness of the proofs. For those proofs—like the men in buckram—are the result, not of observation, but invention. They are such that he who can seriously propose them “passes the strongest condemnation upon himself, and has yet to learn the very first principles of historical criticism.”

The basis of this new, this profoundly accurate, this “authentic chronology,” which, by the waving of the Baron’s magic wand, is to transform the Bible into “a tissue of old woman’s stories and children’s tales,” consists of the dynasties of Manetho preserved by Africanus and Eusebius, and compared with a list of thirty-eight Theban kings, found in Eratosthenes. But the numbers of those dynasties, as they stand, amount to 5300 years, and agree ill with those of Eratosthenes, whose thirty-eight kings occupy only a period of 1076 years. To reduce Manetho’s numbers without impairing Manetho’s authority is an easy task for the Baron. So he picks out these few words from Syncellus—“The period of the hundred and thirteen generations, described by Manetho in his three volumes, comprises a total of 3555 years;”—and makes this passage the foundation of his whole scheme. But, (to quote the words of one of the ablest scholars who have written on this subject,) “this basis of the whole system is a demonstrable and flagrant error. Syncellus, it is plain from his whole work, had not seen the true work of Manetho, and quotes under his name the treatise on the Dogstar—a spurious work, for which Baron Bunsen’s contempt is as great as his admiration for the genuine history.” And yet he complacently observes, *more suo*, “We may venture to assert that the numbers of Manetho have been transmitted to us quite as correctly as those of the canon of Ptolemy. It may therefore be held as established, that Manetho assigned to the Egyptian empire, from Menes to the death of the younger Nectanebus, a period of 3555 years.” Admirable! We have only to “venture to assert;” and then, “it may therefore be held as established.” So that after all the parade of learning, it is the assertion that constitutes the proof.

⁸ The Rev T. R. Birks.

The whole procedure is of a piece with this beginning. Having first assumed—in opposition to all probability—that Manetho gave 3,555 years as the length of the Egyptian monarchy, he then makes this merely conjectural assumption the key-stone of his arch. And the other stones are from the same quarry. Manetho is an accepted authority only so long as he is capable of being cited to overthrow the chronology of the Bible. The moment he stands in the way of this achievement, his importance vanishes. Thus, we are told that “Eratosthenes corrected throughout all the *deficiencies and blunders* which *Manetho did not perceive* to exist in the Egyptian method, in respect to the continuous chronology. The *records of the whole empire were in confusion*; restorations had been made which contradicted each other.”⁹ Now, he who arraigns the Bible on a charge of inconsistency and incongruity, should at least come into court with clean hands. He should know that it is flagrantly inconsistent to heap upon Manetho extravagant laudation at one time, and yet to subject him to unceremonious correction at another; and he should know too, that he who acts thus displays not the self-possessed reasoning of the judge, but the purblind partiality of the partisan. Courses so opposite to each other cannot both be right, and we readily make Bunsen’s admirers a present of their choice. If Manetho is right, he does not serve Bunsen’s purpose; and if he is wrong, he is of course worthless. In either case, the extensive alterations to which his dynasties have been subjected by Bunsen, are completely fatal to their historical value.

But again. Although, according to Bunsen, Eratosthenes was perfectly competent to correct Manetho, he was by no means clever enough to escape the Baron’s own correction in his turn. He calls the sixth king, “Momcheiri;” but this, the far-seeing Baron changes into Sesorcheres, merely because he *must be* Sesorcheres. “Nor is there any other name which can be intended by *Momcheiri*, an evident misspelling.”¹⁰ The manner in which Sesorcheres became Momcheiri should surely have been stated! In like manner—however mystic that may

⁹ Egypt’s Place in U. H. vol. iii. p. 13. ¹⁰ Ibid. vol. ii. p. 73.

be—Gosormies is transformed into Sesortosis, Enentefinaos into Thenillus, and Mentuphis into Chouther! O the credulity of unbelief! It is needless to multiply instances of a method by which “anything may be made out of anything.”

And yet it is of writing and reasoning (or guessing) such as this that Dr. Rowland Williams, in “Essays and Reviews,” is not ashamed to say,—“Any points disputable or partially erroneous, which may be discovered in his many works, are as dust in the balance compared with the mass of solid learning, and the elevating influence of a noble and Christian spirit. Our testimony is, where we have been best able to follow him, we have generally found most reason to agree with him. But our little survey has not traversed his vast field, nor our plummet sounded his depth.” Is this a specimen of Dr. Williams’ irony?¹¹ Of the “Christian spirit” displayed by the Baron we can form some judgment ourselves, when we hear the chronology of the Christian Records denounced with contemptuous irreverence as absurd and ridiculous, “a tissue of old woman’s stories and children’s tales, which contradict each other.” Are we to accept his confounding with the true Manetho, the Old Chronicle, or the spurious Manetho of Syncellus, as proof of his “solid learning?” It is not merely a “disputable point,” but a serious error to suppose that the chronology of Manetho and Eratosthenes is established by the inscriptions on the monuments. It is admitted, indeed, by all Egyptologists that the monuments do contain records of certain astronomical phenomena in connexion with the calendar. But how does our paragon of “solid learning” deal with them? He actually alters a monumental inscription in order to make it square with

¹¹ “Really one ought to speak out about a writer whom persons of such opposite schools in England have at different times so strangely combined to idolize. If any religious and sensible man, no matter what his views so that he be a Christian, can read the passage just referred to [viz. Bunsen’s “Christianity and Mankind,” ed. 1854, vol. iv. part ii. sec.

iii. cc. 2, 3.] without an involuntary thrill of mingled horror, pity, and contempt, I am sadly mistaken. It may sound arrogant, but the truth is greater than great men. And I do say advisedly, that such ravings have seldom darkened counsel by words without knowledge since the days of the Gnostics.”—“Replies to Essays and Reviews,” p. 360.

a preconceived hypothesis. In this arbitrary manner does he treat what he admits to be "the *only one* of the five monuments examined by Biot and De Rongé which combines all the requisites, and may therefore give a positive date." He first supposes a blunder in the inscription, and then by correcting it—of his own profound wisdom, and his own plenary authority—he obtains the "absolute date" which he requires. "Now, supposing the workmen to have cut three of those little strokes instead of two, the inscription would have run," &c., &c. : a process which, for its simplicity and certainty, rivals that of the village schoolmaster for ascertaining the sun's distance from the earth—"you guess at a quarter of the way, and then multiply by four!" And then we are to be gravely told of results thus obtained, that if they do contain any errors, they are but "as dust in the balance!" Or perhaps we should select, as an instance of those depths which the Essayist's plummet cannot sound, the strange indictment against Eusebius ; an indictment sustained by such inversions of plain facts as to elicit from a competent judge this condemnation:—" *Every statement, without exception, is wholly untrue.*"¹²

The truth is, that the tinsel adulation with which Baron Bunsen has been arrayed by his admirers is much too flimsy to prevent examination and exposure. One such exposure, conspicuous for its thorough impartiality, its perfect independence of theological considerations, and its complete conformity to the canons of historical criticism (vindicated by such authorities as Sir George Cornewall Lewis and Mr. Grote,) concludes in words which may well be quoted here. "When a writer calls upon us to correct the chronology of the Bible by a new system derived from his interpretation of Egyptian records, and denounces all persons who do not accept his conclusions as either fools or knaves, he challenges us to examine carefully the authenticity and value of these records, as well as his interpretation of them. Such an examination we have endeavoured to conduct, quite irrespectively of the Bible, upon critical principles alone ; and we feel convinced that no sound scholar,

¹² For the precise application of this sentence, and the detailed proofs of its correctness, see "The Bible and Modern Thought." Appendix, Note C, pp. 466, 467.

whatever may be his theological opinions, can thoroughly test M. Bunsen's method and system, without coming to the conclusion that he has violated the first principles of historical criticism, and that his whole superstructure is raised upon a foundation of sand.”¹³

From these attempts to wrest the facts of geology and archæology so as to alter the date of the Creation, we now revert to the kindred attempts, so strenuously made, to annihilate the fact of the Creation. The former imply that the narrative of Creation as found in Genesis is erroneous in point of time; the latter that it is false as matter of fact. Thus while Sir C. Lyell's chief object is to move men backward to some era of indefinite remoteness in the scale of geological time, Professor Huxley's aim is to degrade man deeply in the scale of animal existence. The one puts him back on the huge dial of duration, the other puts him down in the grade of Nature. Man is no longer “a creature of yesterday,” in the opinion of Lyell; man is no longer a distinct sub-class, in the view of Huxley. According to Lyell, man probably lived a hundred thousand years ago: according to Huxley, he had probably a hundred thousand apes for his ancestors. Poets, in all ages, have sung of men as being little lower than angels, while these modern sages teach that they are only a little higher than apes. “The speculation” of the “Hebrew Descartes” who “asserted as facts what he knew only as probabilities (!)” was that—“God created man.” But our moderns know better. With their characteristic “modesty of assertion,” they do not hesitate to affirm that man was never created at all: he was merely developed—from a monkey! “Lo! here is wisdom:”—“the question of questions for mankind—the problem which underlies all others, and is more deeply interesting than any other—the ascertainment of the place which Man occupies in nature, and of his relations to the universe of things.”¹⁴

¹³ Quarterly Review: vol. cv. p. 415. in Nature: by Thomas Henry Huxley, F.R.S. (London: Williams and Norgate, 1863.)

¹⁴ Evidence as to Man's Place

We all know something of the great gorilla controversy, thanks to M. de Chaillu; and since the late meeting of the British Association at Cambridge, few readers can have remained in ignorance of the important line of demarcation between men and apes, furnished by the much-disputed hippocampus minor. It was a comforting opinion, after all, that we had, as men, a cerebral distinction, even though it was but a minor hippocampus; but (alas!) it is no more! for we are now assured by Prof. Huxley that "all the abundant and trustworthy evidence which we now possess leads to the conviction that, so far from the posterior lobe, the posterior cornu, and the hippocampus minor being structures peculiar to and characteristic of man, as they have been over and over again asserted to be, even after the publication of the clearest demonstration of the reverse, it is precisely these structures which are the most marked cerebral characters common to man with the apes. They are among the most distinctly Simian peculiarities which the human organism exhibits." Thus, then, it appears that while Owen and Huxley differ, apes and men do not. It is an unfortunate circumstance that the more we are developed from apes, the more we differ from each other.

Most people as they advance in life are apt to disown their poor relations; but Prof. Huxley takes an honest pride in parading them all before us in his frontispiece. Here is skeletonized Man lightly tripping forward, followed by a skeletonized Gorilla, who is heavily bending downward; after whom come "Messieurs Chimpanzee, Orang and Gibbon, all in their best bones, and with their best legs foremost." Our Professor confesses however, that when thus "brought face to face with these blurred copies of himself, the least thoughtful of men is conscious of a certain shock;" although he attributes that shock "not so much to disgust at the aspect of what looks like an insulting caricature, as to the awakening of a sudden and profound mistrust of time-honoured theories and strongly-rooted prejudices regarding his own position in nature, and his relations to the under world of life."

We must bear the shock, however, as well as we can; for we are told as to cerebral structure, "it is clear that man differs

less from the chimpanzee or the orang, than these do even from the monkeys ; and that the difference between the brains of the chimpanzee and of man is almost insignificant, when compared with that between the chimpanzee brain and that of a lemur." *Per contra*, as to cerebral *weight*, "there is a very striking difference in absolute mass and weight between the lowest human brain and that of the highest ape." "It may be doubted," adds the Professor, "whether a healthy human adult brain ever weighed less than 31 or 32 ounces, or that the heaviest gorilla brain has exceeded 20 ounces." Yet, as we read in the next page, "the difference in weight of brain between the highest and the lowest men is far greater, both relatively and absolutely, than that between the lowest man and the highest ape." And, in short, "whatever system of organs be studied, the comparison of their modifications in the ape series leads to one and the same result—that the structural differences which separate man from the gorilla and the chimpanzee, are not so great as those which separate the gorilla from the lower apes." No sooner however, have we reached this definite conclusion, than we find it qualified by an assurance that the structural differences between man and the highest apes are neither small nor insignificant. "On the contrary," says the Professor, "let me take this opportunity of distinctly asserting that they are great and significant ; that every bone of a gorilla bears marks by which it might be distinguished from the corresponding bone of a man ; and that in the present creation, at any rate, no intermediate link bridges over the gap between *Homo* and *Troglodytes*." Now, at least, we may imagine that we have grasped a definite difference ; for if *every bone* differs, there is a general, as well as wide distinction between man and the nearest ape. But this is by no means the issue our guide has in view ; so the next sentence but one is this : "Remember, if you will, that there is no existing link between man and the gorilla ; but do not forget that there is a no less sharp line of demarcation, a no less complete absence of any transitional form, between the gorilla and the orang, or the orang and the gibbon. I say not less sharp, though it is somewhat narrower."¹⁵

¹⁵ Ibid. p. 104.

This is sufficiently intelligible; and so our Professor evidently believes it to be; for he says—"On all sides I shall hear the cry—'We are men and women, not a mere better sort of apes, a little longer in the legs, more compact in the foot, and bigger in brain than your brutal chimpanzees and gorillas. The power of knowledge, the conscience of good and evil, the pitiful tenderness of human affections, raise us out of all real fellowship with the brutes, however closely they may seem to approximate us.'" Very well: but how does he answer this objurgation? He proceeds to answer it by saying—"I have endeavoured to show that no absolute structural line of demarcation, wider than that between the animals which immediately succeed us in the scale, can be drawn between the animal world and ourselves; and I may add the expression of my belief that the attempt to draw a psychical distinction is equally futile, and that even the highest faculties of feeling and of intellect begin to germinate in lower forms of life." And further: as if to prevent all possibility of mistake, and at the same time to show how far he himself is from shrinking at this close affinity to our "poor relations," our Professor declares that "our reverence for the ability of manhood will not be lessened by the knowledge that man is, in substance and in structure, one with the brutes."

Justly then has it been said, "After all this, another look at the grim procession of skeletons in the frontispiece is rather discouraging. If the beholder can but conclude that he is one 'in substance and structure' with those gibbering grovelling apes behind man, then where is our pride of ancestry, our heraldic pomp, our vaunted nobility of descent? Any man can now mount armorial bearings in the shape of the long arms of the gibbon or the gorilla. These are our true 'kings-at-arms'; and sculptors, painters, and poets have omitted the greatest of themes."¹⁶

Yet in all this there is no just ground for surprise. The dogmatic statements of Prof. Huxley are but the natural supplement to the plausible suppositions of Mr. Darwin. Not that the Professor is willing to stand or fall by those suppositions alone, however; he thinks it safer to have two strings to his bow:

¹⁶ The Athenaeum, for 1863; p. 288.

for, after stating that he adopts Mr. Darwin's hypothesis, he adds:—"But even leaving Mr. Darwin's views aside, the whole analogy of natural operations furnishes so complete and crushing an argument against the intervention of any but what are termed secondary causes in the production of all the phenomena of the universe, that in view of the intimate relations between man and the rest of the living world, and between the forces exerted by the latter and all other forces, I can see no excuse for doubting that all are co-ordinated terms of Nature's great progression, from the formless to the formed—from the inorganic to the organic—from blind force to conscious intellect and will."¹⁷ Blind as is our Professor, however, to all intervention of The First Great Cause, he sees very clearly "the repugnance with which the majority" of his readers will meet his "conclusions," and avowing that "it would be unworthy cowardice" to ignore that repugnance, he credits himself with considerable courage in braving it. No doubt, it is a courage worthy of a better cause. But for our part, we can but pity the courage which has the misfortune to be allied to such credulous shortsightedness. For what are these grand "conclusions" but a mere revival of the "science falsely so-called"? a science as pretentious, and as powerless now, as it was in the days of Jambres, and as completely exploded as the wildest dreams of astrology. Justin Martyr, speaking of the philosophers of his time, tells us they taught it to be "useless to pray to God, since all things recur according to the unchangeable laws of an endless progression." But in our own time, it is among the successors of Justin Martyr himself, that this antiquated pseudoscience finds its apostles and apologists. It is the "divine," with hopeless inconsistency of profession and practice, who now assures us that prayer for fair weather is inoperative and absurd, because "every shower and every sunbeam has been fore-ordained from the foundation of the world." After this we cannot wonder, however deeply we may regret, that even a Humboldt should say, "In reflecting upon physical phenomena and events, and tracing their causes by the process of reason, we become more and more convinced of the truth of the ancient

¹⁷ Man's place in Nature; p. 108.

doctrine, that the forces inherent in matter, and those which govern the moral world, exercise their action under the control of primordial necessity, and in accordance with movements occurring periodically after longer or shorter intervals."¹⁸ Exactly so! With a series of complimentary bows, God is extruded from His own world; and then, to hide the transparent absurdity of the pretence that "secondary" causes could be either self-originated or self-sustained, the vacant throne of the First Great Cause is filled with an image of their own inventing, dignified and deified as—"primordial necessity!" Behold, the force of loud talking; the magnificence of "big, swelling words!"

But what are the facts? They are these:—First, that these theorists rely principally on the doctrines of spontaneous generation and the transmutation of species; and secondly, that neither the generation nor the transmutation thus relied upon are to be found among actual facts *in rerum natura*.

As to the first of these doctrines: our dogmatists commence (as usual) with an assumption:—an assumption, mark you, which has been demonstrated to have no foundation in fact. No matter: they begin by assuming the "nebular theory." There "must have been" at first this "nebulous matter," this "universal fire-mist." And it *must* have been diffused throughout space, and endowed with certain self-contained and self-evolving laws. When we have once admitted this fundamental postulate, this grand "primordial necessity," it will then be no difficult matter to persuade us "that the primary condition of matter was that of a diffused mass, in which the component molecules were probably kept apart through the efficiency of heat; that portions of this agglomerated into suns, which threw off planets; that these planets were at first very much diffused, but gradually contracted by cooling to their present dimensions;"¹⁹ and, we may add, by running smoothly on in the narrow grooves of the petty tram-roads which our modern sages have laid down for them. The Bible in its sublime simplicity,

¹⁸ Humboldt's *Cosmos*: vol. 1. p. 30. ¹⁹ *Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation*: p. 43, 5th Edition.

tells us that “God made two great lights ; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night : He made the stars also.” But the author of the “Vestiges” knows better. If you venture to ask the grounds of his better knowledge,—he falls back on the old “must have been.” Here are his words :—“It is impossible to suppose a distinct exertion or fiat of Almighty Power for the formation of the earth, wrought up as it is in a complex dynamical connexion, first with Venus on the one hand, and Mars on the other, and secondly with all the other members of the system.”²⁰ Observe the potency, the conclusiveness, the demonstration of this reasoning :—“It is impossible !”

After thus telling us how the world was formed, our philosophers proceed to tell us how it was peopled. “God created man ?” Nothing of the sort. That was a mere guess of the Hebrew Descartes ; a dictum of the “revelation without ;” and the world in its infantile ignorance believed it : but that was “when its beard was not grown as now !”²¹ No, no ; God created only microscopic monads or embryonic points ; and from these, by a process of natural development, extending through cycles of ages, arose all the animated tribes. Creatures of “the simplest and most primitive type gave birth to a type superior to it in compositeness of organization and endowment of faculties ; this again produced the next higher, and so on to the highest ; the advance being in all cases, small, but not of any determinate extent.”²² Or to use the language of Professor Laurenz Oken, another chief of this school,—“No organism is, nor ever has one been created, which is not microscopic. Whatever is larger has not been created, but developed. Man has not been created but developed.” So that as Professor Whewell justly says—“The system ought to be described as a *System of Order in which life grows out of dead matter, the higher out of the lower animals, and man out of brutes.*”²³

If however, any old-fashioned believer in the Bible should be bold enough to ask—“How can life grow out of dead matter ?” he will soon perceive that these philosophical dogmatists labour

²⁰ Ibid. p. 204.

²¹ Carlyle’s Past and Present : p. 312.

²² Vestiges : p. 232.

²³ Whewell’s Indications : p. 12, 2nd Edition.

under the same difficulty as the papal dogmatists who make their saint, after decapitation, walk away with his head in his hands. In both cases, *c'est le premier pas qui coupe*. Compared with the difficulty of starting, all the rest is easy. And yet they must start somehow. Professor Huxley does it boldly : arming himself with a "complete and crushing" "argument against the intervention of *any* but what are termed secondary causes, in the production of ALL the phenomena of the universe." This is noteworthy. A philosopher accounting for all phenomena by secondary causes alone. With him "the first step" is easy, for it is nowhere. All phenomena now existing, depend upon other phenomena previously existing,—therefore they must always have done so! in other words, matter is eternal, and earth never had a beginning. A "crushing argument" truly! Mr. Darwin is not near so bold. He dare not thus substitute "a leap into the dark" for the first step. He modestly says, "I believe that animals have descended from *at most* only four or five progenitors, and plants from an equal or lesser number. Analogy would lead me one step further, namely to the belief that *all* animals and plants have descended from some *one* prototype."²⁴ But what then was that one prototype? The author of the "Vestiges" is quite prepared to tell us. It was a "nucleated vesicle." This "nucleated vesicle, the fundamental form of all organization, we must regard as the meeting-point between the inorganic and the organic—the end of the mineral and the beginning of the vegetable and animal kingdoms, which thence start in different directions, but in a general parallelism and analogy." Nor is this all ; for "this nucleated vesicle is itself a type of mature and independent being in the infusory animalcules, as well as the starting point in the fœtal progress of every higher individual in creation, both animal and vegetable." Further, and more important still, this nucleated vesicle "is a form of being which there is some reason to believe electric agency will produce—though not perhaps usher into full life—in albumen, one of those component materials of animal bodies, in whose combina-

²⁴ On the Origin of Species by means of Natural Selection : by Charles Darwin, M.A., (London : Murray, 1860) p. 484.

tion it is believed there is no chemical peculiarity forbidding their being any day realized in the laboratory. Remembering these things, we are drawn on to the supposition, that the first step in the creation of life upon this planet was *a chemicoelectric operation, by which simple germinal vesicles were produced*. Here then, at last, we have reached "the first step;" but even this must be retraced, for the concurrent testimony of science cries out that it is a false step.

It is sought to be established, however, by the statement that Prevost and Dumas announced some twenty years ago, that "globules could be produced in albumen by electricity." But this sorry prop falls at once before the remark that "if his theory had been that the first step in the process of creation was the formation of vesicles by the wind passing over the ocean, then the fact of boys blowing bubbles in soap and water with a tobacco pipe, and the fable of Venus being born of the froth of the sea, would have been as much to his purpose."

The next crutch brought to prop this baseless theory, is the alleged creation of insects by means of galvanism, as announced by Mr. Crosse at a meeting of the British Association, more than twenty years ago. Unfortunately for the theorists however, this allegation destroys the hypothesis it was meant to support. For it proves too much. Had it merely asserted the production of monads, mere living cells, then, however defective and untrustworthy the evidence on which they rested, the author might have employed them as furnishing an argument in favour of his theory; but they were not monads—they were none of the radiata, they were not even mollusca, but they belonged to the highest type of the articulata, just where that class is supposed, by some zoologists, to pass into the vertebrata. If Mr. Crosse did witness the creation of an acarus, then he witnessed an act of special creation, and our author's law of organic development is at an end. But it is not a fact that either Mr. Crosse or Mr. Weekes witnessed the creation of these acari. That they thought they did, nobody will deny. But these experiments have failed too often, and involve sources of error too numerous to be trusted. "Amongst others, we would mention that a friend of our own visited Mr. Weekes in the hope of seeing the insects created. He waited for some days,

but no indication of an acarus was observed. At last, however, he saw one—here, then, was the creation. He anxiously took his glass from his pocket, to examine its structure, when, on bringing it close enough to be observed, he found the animal was on the *outside* of the bell-glass in which the experiment had been conducted!"²⁵

To cite but one more testimony—the most recent, and considering its author, perhaps the most important—in condemnation of this conjectural creation ; Mr. Darwin writing to the Athenæum, says—"I hope you will permit me to add a few remarks on Heterogeny, as the old doctrine of spontaneous generation is now called, to those given by Dr. Carpenter, who, however, is probably better fitted to discuss the question than any other man in England. Your reviewer believes that certain lowly organized animals have been generated spontaneously—that is, without pre-existing parents—during each geological period in slimy ooze. A mass of mud with matter decaying and undergoing complex chemical changes is a fine hiding place for obscurity of ideas. But let us face the problem boldly. He who believes that organic beings have been produced during each geological period from dead matter, must believe that the first being thus arose. There must have been a time when inorganic elements alone existed in our planet : let any assumptions be made, such as that the reeking atmosphere was charged with carbonic acid, nitrogenized compounds, phosphorus, &c. Now is there a fact, or a shadow of a fact, supporting the belief that these elements, without the presence of any organic compounds, and acted on only by known forces, could produce a living creature ? At present, it is to us a result absolutely inconceivable."²⁶

²⁵ British Quarterly Review, vol. i. p. 501.

²⁶ The Athenæum for 1863 : p. 554.

Dr. Carpenter had previously written thus :—"If your reviewer prefers to suppose that new types of Foraminifera originate from time to time out of the 'ooze,' under the influence of 'polar

forces,' he has, of course, a right to his opinion ; though by most naturalists such 'spontaneous generation' of rotalines and nummulites will be regarded as a far more 'astounding hypothesis' than the one for which it is offered as a substitute. But I hold that mine is the more scientific, as being conformable to the fact

Here then we may dismiss this first and fundamental doctrine of "naturalism," as disowned and disavowed by naturalists themselves. On their own showing, there is neither a fact, nor a shadow of a fact, to support it; and it is "absolutely inconceivable." The Truth of Science confirms the Truth of Scripture, and admits no other origin of animated being than the inexhaustible energy of that Creative Spirit who, in primæval chaos, first "brooded" on the face of the waters.

Nor is the second, or developmental theory, more fortunate. That theory asserts, as we have seen, that "the simplest and most primitive type gave birth to a type superior to it;" "this again produced the next higher, and so on to the highest;" "an advance, under favour of peculiar conditions, from the simplest forms of being to the next more complicated." We must thus go back to the infusorial point, "whose seed was in itself," for the germ of human existence, and then, in retracing our steps, notice how throughout the whole marvellous process there is no mixture of the supernatural.

But the very first thing that strikes us is, that this effort to avoid the supernatural is itself supernatural. For, according to this theory, it cannot be said either of the first infusorial point or of any of its products, that its seed is in itself; but rather that it is endowed with the seed of the next being higher in the scale. Like produces like; that is natural: but it is the very fundamental principle of this theory that like produces unlike, and that is supernatural. The illustrative examples, however, by which the theory might have gained a basis of actual fact, are not to be found. Their place has to be supplied by conjecture. Thus *e.g.*, Mr. Darwin says, "I cannot doubt that the theory of descent with modification embraces all the members of the same class."²⁷ And again: "I can indeed hardly doubt that all vertebrate animals having true lungs, have descended, by ordinary generation from an ancient prototype, of which we know nothing, furnished with a floating

...; whilst his is *not supported by any evidence* that rotalines or nummulites ever originate spontaneously, either in 'ooze' or

anywhere else." (Athenæum for 1863: p. 461.)

²⁷ *Origin of Species* : p. 484.

apparatus or swim-bladder." "It is conceivable that the now utterly lost branchiae might have been gradually worked in by natural selection for some quite distinct purpose, in the same manner as . . . it is probable that organs which at a very ancient period served for respiration, have been actually converted into organs of flight."²⁸ Now, all this is mere conjecture. First, it is *assumed* that swim-bladders are used for the purpose of oxygenizing the blood of fishes. Next, it is *assumed* that these modified swim-bladders are transformed into lungs to form the bronchiaæ by which the blood of land animals is oxygenized. And lastly, it is very modestly assumed that the mere possession of lungs, which show palpably that their possessors were purposed and constituted, not for living in water, but in air, betrays their aquatic origin!²⁹ This is the triumphant conclusion drawn from such elaborate arguments as "I can hardly doubt," "I cannot doubt," "It is conceivable," "It is probable;" and then this conclusion is "worked up" as an established fact, for the purpose of establishing other notions, equally illogical, with just an equal amount of demonstration. Such vagaries do indeed shew how easily the process of argument can be conducted when the conclusion is foregone. "From the beginning of the book to the end, we have not one jot of direct and substantial evidence in favor of this theory, by which the belief of the whole Christian world is to be overthrown. It is conjecture at the beginning, conjecture in the middle, conjecture at the conclusion, conjecture throughout. Facts, whose evidence might be turned into quite another channel, are bent into one particular direction. The absence of facts is made to tell in the same direction—imagination being called upon to fill up the hiatus."³⁰

There still remain facts, however, whose evidence cannot be thus tortured: and foremost among these, for its recency, as well as for the high authority on which it rests, is the general fact that "there has been no advance in the foraminiferous type from the palæozoic period to the present time." Such is

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 191.

their aquatic origin." (*Ib.* p. 196.)

²⁹ "Land animals, which in their lungs or modified swim-bladders betray

³⁰ *Christian Observer*, vol. lix., p. 565.

the explicit testimony of an authority to whose perfect competency Mr. Darwin himself has paid a handsome tribute in estimating it more highly than that of "any other man in England :" the testimony of Dr. Carpenter, in his recent "Introduction to the Study of the Foraminifera." And by this testimony, as he has subsequently stated, we are put in possession of his "conviction that the present state of scientific evidence, instead of sanctioning the idea that the descendants of the primitive type or types of Foraminifera can ever rise to any higher grade, justifies the *anti-Darwinian* inference, that however widely they diverge from each other and from their originals, *they still remain Foraminifera.*"³¹

Now, how does Mr. Darwin deal with this absolute matter of fact, this unquestionable "scientific evidence ?" Characteristically enough, he first admits what he finds impossible to deny, and then proceeds to supplement his extorted admission with a gratuitous assertion that renders it null and void. He says that the objection to his views, furnished by the fact now stated, "is grounded on the belief—the prevalence of which seems due to the well-known doctrine of Lamarck—that there is some necessary law of advancement, against which view I have often protested."³² So that while making the distinct admission "that certain groups of animals, such as the Foraminifera, have not advanced in organization" "from an extremely remote epoch to the present day," he first protests against the doctrine of development, which hitherto he has been universally understood to maintain ; and then neutralizes his own admission by adding that "as we do not know under what forms or how life originated in this world, it would be rash to assert that even

³¹ Dr. Carpenter's Letter to "The Athenæum" of April 4th, 1863 : p. 461.

Scarcely less pertinent to the subject in hand, is another sentence in the same letter :— "Surely the derivation of a certain number of the Mollusks at present inhabiting the Mediterranean, by direct continuity of descent from the identical types

whose shells are entombed in the Tertiary formations of its shores, is a fact as well established as the derivation of the existing races of men from those which peopled the globe during the pre-historic period."

³² Mr. Darwin's Letter to "The Athenæum" of April 25th, 1863 ; p. 554.

such lowly endowed animals as the Foraminifera, with their beautiful shells as figured by Dr. Carpenter, have not in any degree advanced in organization.”³³ So that with Dr. Carpenter’s words (just quoted) before him, condemning, as opposed to scientific evidence, the idea that the Foraminifera “*can ever*” advance, Mr. Darwin still declares that it would be rash to assert that they *have* not advanced. Mr. Darwin says that he perceives no force in Dr. Carpenter’s “objection” to his views. Dr. Carpenter may well reply that he perceives no force in Mr. Darwin’s “protest” against the doctrine of Lamarck.

It is a triumph for the facts of the case, however, that one who has displayed such singular ingenuity in their “natural selection,” should yet be constrained to appear to protest against the doctrine which in reality he has subserved. Those facts are in irreconcileable hostility to that doctrine. Even Humboldt—who, as we have seen, could proclaim himself a believer in “primordial necessity”—shewed this doctrine no mercy. “What displeases me in Strauss,” says he, “is the scientific levity which leads him to see no difficulty in the organic springing from the inorganic, nay, man himself from Chaldean mud.”^{33†} Nothing is more obvious than that if the development theory were true, the earlier fossils would have been very small in size, and very low in organization. But the very reverse is the case. We meet with giants where we should have found dwarfs, and creatures of a high organization instead of creatures of a low one. In one of the ablest replies to this fanciful hypothesis, Hugh Miller shows that the oldest ganoids yet known, are, both as to size and organization, in direct opposition to it. “Up to a certain point in the geologic scale we find that the ganoids *are not*; and when they at length make their appearance upon the stage, they enter large in their stature, and high in their organization.”³⁴ The Fossil Flora also contradict it. At the base of the Old Red Sandstone where, according to the development theory, “nothing higher than a lichen or a moss could have been expected, the ship-carpenter

³³ Ibid. ^{33†} Letters to Varnhagen: First Edition, p. 117.

³⁴ Footprints of the Creator: p. 105.

might have hopefully taken axe in hand to explore the woods for some such stately pine as the one described by Milton.”³⁵ But our theorists, unable to deny either the truth or the force of these stubborn facts, have the audacity to rely on other, *supposed* facts, which, until they can be found, must be imagined. Because the facts of geology, so far from affording a shadow of support to their theory, combine to refute it, they fall foul of geology. Thus Mr Darwin himself shews³⁶ that the species of a group sometimes appear to have come in abruptly; and confesses that this abrupt entrance of fresh species, unless it can be explained away, i.e., resolved into a *false* appearance, would be fatal to his views. He searches the genealogical record in vain for transitional forms between distinct species or members of a distinct genus, which would serve for evidence that they might have been transmitted from the same parents; and then when this search has proved absolutely futile, instead of candidly confessing that his case is rendered doubtful for lack of distinct testimony—that it is even highly improbable, since those forms are *always* absent—he tells us that “Nature may almost be said to have guarded against the frequent discovery of her transitional or linking forms.”³⁷ His readers, however, will be apt to view the matter in another light, and to say that since these transitional forms have nowhere been shown to exist, it is no marvel they have not been discovered. His search of the geological record is just as vain; and his reasoning on it just as inconsequential. Thus we are told, “It would be vain to look for animals having the common embryological character of the vertebrata, until beds far beneath the lowest Silurian strata are discovered—a discovery of which the chance is very small.”³⁸ So small, indeed, that if the adoption of the development theory is to be preceded by that discovery, it may be at once postponed to the Greek Kalends. To cite but one other instance of this sort, our author further says, “I do not pretend that I should ever have suspected how poor a record of the mutations of life the best preserved geological section presented, had not the difficulty of our not discovering innumerable tran-

³⁵ Ibid., p. 120.

³⁶ “Origin of Species:” p. 316.

³⁷ Ibid., p. 293.

³⁸ Ibid., p. 338.

sitional links between the species which appeared at the commencement and close of each formation pressed so hardly on my theory." Striking as is this language as a specimen of inverted reasoning, it is hardly less striking as an exhibition of the weakness of the case it was meant to defend. For it is a confession that the verification of the theory in question requires the production of "innumerable transitional links;" that these links cannot be found; that their non-discovery presents a difficulty so serious as to endanger the theory; and that to escape the danger thus imminent, our theorists have felt themselves obliged to impugn the accuracy of the geologic record itself.

Nor is this an isolated confession of Mr Darwin alone. Professor Huxley, who, as we have seen, can traverse "the production of all the phenomena of the universe" without meeting its First Great Cause—can trace the theory of development from the monad up to man, without the intervention of the Maker of either—can detect "even the highest faculties of feeling and of intellect" in lower forms of life—even he, with all his ability, has not been able to find the apes to which he assigns the honors of the ancestors of men. "The fossil remains of Man hitherto discovered," says he, "do not seem to me to take us appreciably nearer to that lower pithecid form, by the modification of which he has, probably, became what he is. . . . Where then must we look for primæval Man? Was the oldest *Homo sapiens* pliocene or miocene, or yet more ancient? In still older strata do the fossilized bones of an ape more anthropoid, or a man more pithecid than any yet known await the researches of some unborn paleontologist? Time will show. But, in the meanwhile, if any form of the doctrine of progressive development is correct, we must extend by long epochs the most liberal estimate that has yet been made of the antiquity of Man." Admirable! *If* that unborn paleontologist would only make his appearance; *if* he would only discover something to the purpose; *if* he could only hammer out of the rocks those pithecid men, or anthropoid apes, which at present exist only in the clouds; *if*, in short, any form of the development theory could only be shown to be correct (for any form would do); why, then we should at least have one pertinent and palpable fact to start with. What, gentlemen! when we plead the cer-

tainty of "Thus saith the Lord," can your philosophy do no more than answer us with *ifs*? Has it no more wisdom than to assume these various, curious, and conflicting suppositions as if they were so many demonstrations? This may be the science of speculation: but Locke and Newton knew nothing of it; it is not the science of induction.

Further. Professor Huxley's facts are opposed to his conclusions. We have already seen what great stress he lays on the fact that the difference between one family of man and another, is greater than that between the lowest man and the highest ape.³⁹ But when he has done this, he proceeds in each case to show that there is a far greater difference between this same ape, and one or other of the remaining classes of apes. From these two statements we draw the important corollary, that "there is the same, or an analogous kind of distinction between one family of man and another, and between one family of ape and another." He has thus suggested a thought which proves destructive to his theory: viz., that the families of men are sprung from one type, and the families of apes from another; or, in other words, that there is a generic as well as a specific difference between man and apes.

Again. Professor Huxley announces his belief that there is no more psychical, than there is physical distinction between man and ape.⁴⁰ But, the Professor apart, it will be allowed on all hands that viewed socially, morally, religiously, and historically, men and apes are utterly and generically distinct. This either involves a generic distinction between the physiological structure of men and apes, or it does not. If it does, then Professor Huxley's theory is overthrown. If it does not, then "the cause of the distinction must be looked for elsewhere, and science will have to grant that man partakes of an immaterial element, which physiology cannot grasp, and which is the cause of those peculiarities in his nature which elevate him so far above the rest of the animal world."⁴¹ "After all, assuredly, man is best characterised by the psychical distinctions which in such treatises as the present, [Professor Huxley's,] are left

³⁹ Man's Place in Nature: p. 78. ⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 109.

⁴¹ Christian Advocate and Review: vol. iii, p. 505.

wholly out of view, or dismissed in a passing sentence. Conscience, remorse, ambition, sense of responsibility, improvableness of reason, immense advances in knowledge, self-cultivation, æsthetical sensibilities—these and other qualities of the *Homo sapiens*, not to speak of religious sentiments, broadly and plainly distinguish man from all the Simians and Troglodytes. Grant, for a moment, (what is manifestly inconsistent with the previous statement, that ‘the structural differences between man and the highest apes are great and significant,’) that man is one in substance and structure with these creatures ; grant even that their instincts simulate our reason in some remarkable instances ; and when all is granted, the vast and varied differences just intimated remain as towering distinctions. To these is added that gift of articulate speech which, though mechanically organized, imparts supreme value to them all ; which makes man a communicative being ; which gives to a lecturer, such as Professor Huxley, that power to instruct, amuse and illustrate, by which he is raised immeasurably above the cleverest ape that ever climbed a tree, or built a nest, or buried his dead companion under the dried leaves of an African forest.”⁴² The fact is incontestible ; and to him who seeks not to be wise above what is written, the reason of it is plain :—“There is a spirit in man ; and the breath of the Almighty giveth him understanding.”

“I had rather believe all the fables in the Legend, and the Talmud, and the Alcoran, than that this universal frame is without a mind.” So said the author of the “*Novum Organum*.⁴³” To the same purpose, but even more explicitly pertinent to our subject, is the remark of the author of the “*Principia*,” that it “belongs to natural philosophy to enquire concerning God from the observation of phenomena.” “In the powers of fire, light, and electricity, we have glorious proof of what God can do ; and who can trace the services in which he employs those mighty, but mindless things, without asking, To what style of achievement may he not yet conduct the spirit of man, which daily demonstrates its superiority to them by making them all its instruments ? The man who discovers

⁴² The *Athenæum* for 1863, p. 288. ⁴³ *Essays Civil and Moral* (xvi.)

and exhibits the servants whom our Maker has been pleased to create and employ in nature's mechanism, helps me to adore more humbly his eternal power and Godhead ; as also to take conceptions of the possible attainments of my own soul, which more impress me with the responsibility of its possession, the need to be sedulous in its culture. His industry deserves, and has, my gratitude. But if he descants on the wonders of agents which, after all, have neither will nor judgment, no not the knowledge of their own existence, without rising higher, he forces me to think of a mechanic who would account for all the marvels of the factory, the telegraph, or the calculating machine, by referring you to the engine-room, the battery, or the frame-work, without one allusion to an inventive or presiding mind. Light is at this moment rejoicing every eye in a hundred nations ; but it knows it not ; it has no share in the vivacity which it bestows on living things ; no sense of the beauty wherewith it decks the inanimate. It is ennobling to ponder the laws under which nature operates. But laws never make themselves.”⁴⁴ And so thought the immortal Newton when he said “A God without dominion, providence, and final causes, is nothing but fate and nature.” But the Hunterian Professor knows better. Final causes, like providential intervention, must give way before his “crushing argument.” If the myriad-minded Shakspeare, or the sublime Dante, do differ at all from the prating parrot, or the jabbering baboon, it is in degree, but not in kind ; for “even the highest faculties of feeling and of intellect begin to germinate in lower forms of life.” The greatness of Alfred, the prowess of Charlemagne, the art of Raphael, the conceptions of Leibnitz, the creations of Handel and Beethoven, the science of Faraday and Owen, the Provincial Letters, the Principia, and Paradise Lost—not to speak of the strains of Isaiah, or David, or Paul :—write “Ichabod” upon all of them ; for the glory is departed ; man is imbruted ; and the highest, the best, the noblest, of our race, are “in substance and in structure, one with the brutes” ! If grand old Samuel Johnson were alive, he would say again—but with even more

⁴⁴ Rev. W. Arthur's “Mission to the Mysore ;” ch. iii.

emphatic indignation—"Sir! it is a brutal doctrine." And so it is.

But it is not the only one: equally opposed to Scripture, and equally destitute of foundation in fact, is the doctrine of the Plurality of Races. According to this doctrine, Man, created in the image of God, and placed in a worthy scene, under a fitting and noble economy of moral probation, disappears from our view. In his place we are offered a dozen or a hundred savages and moral vagrants, thrown suddenly here and there upon the earth's surface, we know not how or why—a pair of Caucasians, of Monguls and Malays, a negro and a negress, an Australian black and his female drudge—left to fight their own way in the world, with no ray of light upon the purpose of their creation, or the moral laws of their being.⁴⁵

Now this teaching is even more plainly opposed than Darwinism itself to the declarations that "God hath made all nations of one blood," that "in Adam all die," and that of the sons of Noah exclusively "was the whole earth overspread." But the point to be especially noticed here is this; that, flatly as it is opposed to Scripture, it is, if possible, still more flatly opposed to Darwinism. It differs from the Bible in asserting the original creation, not of one, but of several pairs of human beings from whom distinct races are derived. But Darwinism views mankind as being neither one race nor many, but merely the fraction of a race: a race which certainly includes monkeys, and probably asses, frogs, and fishes, in one and the same family descent. This mutual contradiction among the opponents of the Bible is a great triumph for the truth of the Bible. The self-same facts are not to be adduced in support of theories diametrically opposed to each other. If Mr. Darwin's theory is proved, then Mr. Crawfurd's is disproved; and on the other

⁴⁵ "It seems to some of our modern scientific theorists an easier thing to create a score of red, brown, white, and black Adams and Eves, wherewith to increase, multiply, and replenish each 'realm,' or province of the ancient

world, than to believe that man, was transferred to new regions, or affected by their physical influences, just as we see the horse, ox, and hog have been in our own day." Dr. Wilson's "*Prehistoric Man*;" vol. i., p. 150.

hand, Mr. Crawfurd cannot be right unless Mr. Darwin be wrong. The truth is that between the various theories which have been started to supersede the Bible there is a mutual and interneccine hostility. Their number indeed is Legion ; but their consistency is nothing better than Babel. Fifty years hence one may read their epitaph in the history of the combatants by the pool of Gibeon :—“They caught every one his fellow by the head, and thrust his sword in his fellow’s side ; and so they fell down together.”

On a par with their mutual hostility is their mutual dogmatism. Thus, a doughty advocate of this doctrine, giving battle to Lyell, Lamarck, Darwin, Huxley, *et hoc genus omne*, has these words :—“I conclude, then, that there is no shadow of evidence for the unity of the human race, and none for its having undergone any appreciable change of form.”⁴⁶ The most obvious inference from these words is, that Christianity has but little to fear. The antagonism arrayed against the Bible is as impotent as it is braggart. If men of such acknowledged ability as Lyell, Darwin, and Huxley can adopt opinions unsustained by even a “shadow of evidence,” we shall know how to estimate those opinions when they are adverse to the teaching of the Bible. But passing by this, we are in some doubt which to admire most :—the profundity, or the superficiality, of the man who has weighed all the testimonies of history and physiology in his search for the evidence that has satisfied the world for ages, and yet has found none. And then, too, his simplicity and modesty :—he has found none ; *ergo*, there is none! Why, this feat rivals that of Mr. Goodwin himself.⁴⁷ How much this gentleman knows! He knows what startling contrasts in stature, complexion, and temperament, often occur among brothers and sisters of the same family. He is aware of that elastic power in the human frame by which it can adapt itself to different climates, in a degree which no mere animal is known to attain.⁴⁸ Ordinary people confess that they do not

⁴⁶ “Public Opinion” for 1863 : p. 555.

⁴⁷ Essays and Reviews, p. 252.

⁴⁸ Dr. Wilson, in a most interesting and instructive discussion

on the mutations which the human frame may undergo, under the various influences and conditions to which human life is subjected, notices, amongst others, the

know whether this power is the same in all ages, or varies from age to age; whether it belongs alike to all races, or to some above others; whether it depends partly on the mental powers or is purely physical: but your dogmatic assertor of the Plurality of Races is no ordinary ignoramus. The personal differences in children of the same parents, are regarded by ordinary people as being perfectly unaccountable; and that for what seems to them a most sufficient reason—there is actually no cause whatever, at present known to us, by which they can be either anticipated or explained. How are the characters and physical properties of either parent, or both, transmitted to the child? How far does family likeness extend, and within what limits is it confined? What determines the sex, the stature, the complexion, the constitution of human offspring? To questions such as these, the wisdom of the ancients answered, “Such knowledge is too wonderful for me; it is high, I cannot attain unto it;” but our moderns, because they stand six inches higher than their predecessors of the last generation, at once imagine themselves to have scaled the Mont Blanc of science, and that the whole landscape lies spread out before them. We will believe them when “by taking thought” they “can add unto their stature one cubit!”⁴⁹

But leaving these occult and mysterious influences, whose force we cannot measure, and whose operation we cannot pretend to understand, we shall do well to remember the force and effect of those which we can understand. Are our opponents prepared to say what is the limit of those changes which may be produced by climate, by civilization or barbarism, acting on natural and credible diversities in children derived originally

remarkable fact that already, “the New Englander differs in many respects from the Old Englander,” and that, for any one familiar with the New England physiognomy, it is easy to point out the Yankee in the midst of any assemblage of Englishmen.—*Pre-historic Man*: vol. ii., p. 124.

⁴⁹ What a contrast between the

arrogant assumptions of these pretenders to knowledge and the modest confession of such great masters as Cuvier!—“The origination of beings is the greatest mystery in the economy of organism; we see them developed in all nature, but never see them fashioned.”

from the same parents? Is there one of them that can pretend to tell us how far famine and plenty, a scanty ungenerous diet, habits of order and subjection to moral law, or of a life barbarous and almost animal in its nature, influence the features and the brain, and, in course of time, affect the very form of the skull, degrading it below the normal type of intelligent manhood? Not one. And yet these are the theorists so ignorant and contemptuous of matters within their reach, and so wise in matters beyond them, who can glibly talk of there being "no shadow of evidence for the unity of the human race!" We, on the other hand, submit that a candid observer who takes note of the physical and moral divergence which may take place in a single lifetime between two sons of the same parents; and who duly estimates the result, when the possible divergence of a single descent has been multiplied and accumulated, like compound interest, through the hundred and twenty generations from the days of Noah to our own; such a one will readily admit, as matter of simple demonstration, that the amount of divergence, physical and moral, thus obtained is very far in excess of the like differences which actually separate the extremes of the human race. It is the contrary conclusion alone that is sustained by "no shadow of evidence."

If now we turn from the speculations of physiology to the facts of history, we shall find the views of our theorists still characterized by the same obliquity of vision. "In the late advocacy of the doctrine at Newcastle, the point most insisted on was the distinctness of the negro from the white man, not only on grounds of anatomy and physiognomy, but of inferior mental capacity, and a distinct locality, with a fauna and flora peculiar to itself alone. But in Homer, the Ethiopians occupy two regions widely apart, towards the rising and the setting sun. In dignity, also, they rank so high as to be the chosen hosts and entertainers of the celestial gods. In Herodotus, four or five centuries later, the description is much the same." They are represented as the tallest and handsomest of men; and as choosing their king for superior height and personal beauty. And this ancient representation of the Ethiopians as a (not inferior, but) superior race, curiously enough, received a double confirmation at the very Meeting where the opposite doctrine

was so pretentiously propounded. For it was at that Meeting that Sir E. Belcher stated that the handsomest specimen of a man whom he had met with was a native African ; while, as to the intellectual part of the question, the best answer was furnished by the fact that Mr. Crawfurd's principal opponent was himself an African. When, in the oldest book in the world—a book not less venerable for its accuracy than for its antiquity—we read that the primeval kingdoms of the greatest power (Babylon, Nineveh, Egypt,) were all of Hamitish origin, we read nothing more than is corroborated by other authentic history, and by the notorious facts of every-day life. But our opponents cannot see it ! As determined as the hero of the Nile to see only what suits them, they apply the glass to the blind eye, and tell us that they perceive not even a shadow of evidence. They bear no faint resemblance to the lofty Mrs. Jellaby, with her contemptuous disregard for whatever was under her nose, and her dreamy eyes that “ could see nothing nearer than Africa.”

But, whether acknowledged or ignored, the facts remain the same. “ The testimony of universal history and tradition, and the results of philological and physical researches, combine in corroborating the intimations derived from the Sacred Scriptures of the eastern origin of nations, and of the three great divisions, which analogies of language and physical characters alike justify, into the *Semitic*, or Syro-Arabian, inhabiting the countries between Egypt and the Ganges—the *Japetic*, or Indo-European, extending from the mouths of the Ganges over Northern Asia, Europe, and America—and the *Hamitish*, or Ethiopian, who peopled Africa.⁵⁰ At what period, whether

⁵⁰ On the two points most controverted—the severance of the Indian population of the American continent from the old-world family of man, and the affinity of Ethiopian to European races—the weighty testimony of Dr. Wilson is as explicit as it is valuable. As to the first, he maintains that no known facts can

justly be made to impugn the common belief, that the present native races of America are derived from the selfsame single stock from which the rest of mankind have sprung; and he denies that there are any physical features which render it improbable that those races are the descendants of emigrants from

at the birth of the three sons of Noah, or in subsequent ages ; or by the operation of what causes, whether causes no longer existing, or causes operating in particular circumstances now unknown, the physical characters which distinguish those three great divisions, or the varieties into which they have been sub-divided, were produced, we are unable even to conjecture.”⁵¹ Happily for us, such conjectures are as unnecessary as they are unsatisfactory. We have an abundance of facts ; and the evidence which those facts furnish, whether taken negatively or positively, is equally conclusive in its attestation of the Scripture doctrine of the unity of the human race. Negatively, it is certain that, separately considered, the physical characters which distinguish different races of men are not greater than those which distinguish individuals of the same race ; they are not specific ; there is nothing to render the supposition improbable that the distinctions of races did originate in the same family. Positively, it is certain, that tribes of animals, which belong to different species, differ from each other in a variety of particulars, in which the most dissimilar of human races betray no such differences. This variety of particulars includes both the physical and the psychical ; and the accumulated evidence thus obtained is perfectly conclusive as to that identity of species which unites the several varieties of mankind.⁵²

One other remark remains to be made. Directly opposed as is the school of Messrs. Knox and Craufurd to that of Sir Charles Lyell on this subject, both are based on one and the same fundamental error. It is the Uniformitarian hypothesis adopted by Sir Charles, and condemned, as we have seen, not only by such great names as Murchison, Phillips, and Whewell, but by facts so irresistible as to have compelled the assent of those names and even of Sir Charles himself. It is this exploded uniformitarianism applied to ethnography which has led

certain parts of Asia, centuries ago. He finds the same “characteristic physical traits” in the American Indian and in the Asiatic Mongolian. (Vol ii. p 329.) As to the second, he sees no difficulty in deducing the negro

race, and the European type of man, from a common origin.

⁵¹ British Quarterly Review ; vol. i., p. 366.

⁵² This argument, as summed up by Dr. Prichard, will be found in the Appendix ; Note B.

its advocates to imagine the plurality of races. Applied to a widely different subject, it has lately led a usually cautious writer, of a different school, to a kindred conclusion. But no matter by whom adopted, or to what applied, it is simply a delusion and a snare. All history and all experience cry out against it. To what period of English history shall we apply the measure of progress furnished by the last half century? In the civilization of mankind, as well as in the consolidation of the earth on which they tread, we find periods of special and exceptional activity, interposed between protracted periods of seeming stagnation or even retrogression. And similarly it follows, that any calculation of the time required for the formation of distinct races of men based upon their present rate of change, and the intervals that now separate them, must be wide of the truth. "It is a calculation of the periodic time of the comet from its sluggish movement in the aphelion ; or of the time spent by the melted Alpine snows in reaching the sea from the dull and lifeless current of the lagunes at the mouth of the Po. The providential task of such organic tendencies on the human frame has been long ago fulfilled. The various corps of the great human army were then marching into the positions they were to occupy ; but they have occupied them long ago. Each regiment has planted itself on its own ground, and manned its own breastworks, and held its post for ages, in the conflict with the powers of nature—with arctic snows and mountain glaciers, with local malaria, and the burning heat of tropical suns. And thus, no evidence for the complete separation of races in early times, whether it mount to the days of Homer, or ascend still higher to the time of Moses, and the Rameses of Egypt, can furnish any solid ground for doubting the truth of the Bible narrative, and interpolating some thousands of years, barren and desolate of all historical traces, beyond and above the Scriptural accounts of the infancy of the world."⁵³

It is when we thus review the facts on which our opponents profess to rely that we perceive the utter worthlessness of the theories which they build upon them. The investigation we

⁵³ "The Antiquity of Man :" No. vii. Reprinted from "The Record."

have been pursuing leads to this inevitable result:—that the allegations made in the name of modern science against the teaching of the Bible, are allegations unsustained by proof. The scientific objections are unscientific. For they are illogical. They are inconsistent. They are inconclusive. They are mutually hostile. They are such that if some of them are true, the rest must of necessity be false. They involve syllogisms where the premiss is an improbable conjecture, and the conclusion a glaring *non sequitur*. In defiance alike of history and common sense our opponents have invented a diversity of origin for the human race; but then the process by which they have achieved their invention is just as scientific as it would be to classify English statesmen by the rules of palmistry or the size of their great toes. They have asserted that man is in substance, as well as in structure, one with the brutes; but the assertion is so absurdly contrary to fact that the common sense of mankind laughs it to scorn. They have maintained the diversity of species to be so great that the human race alone must have had half-a-dozen different origins; but then they have also maintained that diversity to be so small that all the families of mankind, together with monkeys, donkeys, frogs and fishes, are nothing more than ordinary varieties of one common original. They have traced a gradual development and transmutation of species from the monad up to man; but then the particular instances of this development are what no one has ever seen, and the transitional links, what no one has ever found. By theorizing on the nebulæ, they managed to put the world's Creator far away out of their sight—until it turned out that the nebulæ were not nebulous! And when at last forced to admit the fact of Creation, loud were their declarations that we must alter its date. More loud indeed than unanimous; for when you ask what are the reasons for which the Bible must be abandoned, or what is the substitute which we are offered in its stead, the conflict of answers is a new Confusion of Tongues. Geology, ethnology, philology, archaeology, and palæontology are severally summoned, cross-examined, and discredited, while their confused and contradictory utterances are trumpeted forth as the only trustworthy answer to the question “What is Truth?” And so unanimous are the trumpeters—the heralds

of that modern science which is to overthrow the Bible—that in answer to a single enquiry as to the antiquity of Man, Sir Charles Lyell offers us a certain date which, he says, would probably be more correct if multiplied by four; Bunsen requires at all events "twenty millenia" for certain philological developments; Mr. Jukes thinks that 100,000 years is but "a small time to allow for the physical changes which have taken place" during the period that man has apparently existed on the earth; while a learned German (Theban?) tells us there is every reason to believe that the true answer is nine millions of years—but at all events (out of those nine millions) he is sure of thirty-five thousand—we may take his word for it!

Is this the sort of science that shall shake our faith in Scripture?

One thing is certain: it is not the sort that Newton would acknowledge. It is not the patient, the strenuous, the unfaltering application of all legitimate means of discovery, and of such means alone. It is not the solid, the profound, the cautious spirit of that philosophy which is content to abide by the demonstrations which competent evidence supplies. On the contrary, it is the daring ambition of the vain man who would be wise—wise above what is written; who has stepped beyond the field of experience to expatiate on the field of imagination; who has ventured on a dark unknown, where the wisest of all philosophy is the philosophy of silence, and a profession of ignorance is the best evidence of a solid understanding; who knows not the limit of his own faculties, but has overleaped the barrier which hems in all the possibilities of human attainment; and who, on that ever-shifting ground, by every step he takes, widens his distance from the true philosophy, and by every affirmation he utters, rebels against the authority of all its maxims. It is the vain attempt of Jannes and Jambres to withstand "the finger of God;" the pretence of knowing, made by men who, of the Truths which they assail, know nothing yet as they ought to know; the gnosticism equally conceited and superficial, which still retains the unenviable, but not unmerited, distinction so long ago acquired, of "Science, FALSELY SO CALLED."

The contrast between the modesty of true science and the unblushing impudence of assertion which gives currency to its counterfeit, may be conspicuously seen, however, not only in that extravagant laudation which our modern sciolists keep for themselves ; but also in the quasi-judicial denunciations which they bestow so plentifully upon all who dare to differ from them. Thus, according to Mr Goodwin,⁵⁴ the Hebrew prophet with whom “the Lord spake face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend,” was merely some “early speculator” who asserted “solemnly and unhesitatingly that for which he must have known that he had no authority.” It is true indeed that the man who should make such mendacious assertions now-a-days, would be justly branded as an incorrigible liar ; but then we must make allowance for Moses, because, forsooth, being destitute of that “modesty of assertion which the spirit of true science has taught us,” he “was harassed by no such scruples, and asserted as facts what he knew only as probabilities.” Could there be a more keenly pointed satire on an opponent of Moses than that which Mr. Goodwin has here inflicted on himself ? To say, and to say truly, that true science is characterized by modesty of assertion, and yet to show his own utter destitution of that modesty by making such an assertion as this. If this is his modesty, alas for his science !

But, in truth, that science stands fatally condemned on other grounds, beside its unblushing immodesty of assertion. It is condemned on the verdict of the great masters in geology, as well as by the patent fallacy of its own reasoning.

For observe the wide difference between what Mr. Goodwin was bound to do, and what he has actually done. Unless he would incur the imputation of having wantonly and falsely given the lie to Moses, he was bound to show that the statements of Moses were not true. Yet this is what he has so palpably failed to do, as to suggest the idea that he feared it could not be done. He may have begun by attempting it ; he has certainly finished without achieving it. What he has achieved, is a very different thing. He has exhibited all the inconsistencies he could find in a comparison of the several

⁵⁴ Essays and Reviews, p. 252.

schemes of Dr. Buckland, Hugh Miller, and Archdeacon Pratt. And he seems to think he has done a good deal when he has set one of these writers in opposition to another. At last he puts them all aside because he finds them "at variance with each other, and mutually destructive." The answer is obvious. Mr. Goodwin's business was not with Buckland, or Miller, or Pratt, but with Moses. He had to demonstrate that the account of the Creation given in the first chapter of Genesis is not true. But he has done nothing of the kind. His indictment against Moses remains to this hour "Not Proven;" and by a natural consequence it recoils with fearful force upon himself. It is Mr. Goodwin who, by attributing untruthfulness to Moses, has fallen into the unenviable position of one who erroneously asserts as a fact the gross illusion which he had mistaken for a probability.

But this is not all. Mr. Goodwin's digression is not only altogether irrelevant, it is also, in the highest degree, unfair. It is unfair in its studied avoidance of those fundamental points on which the writers whom he represents as discordant are unanimous against himself; and where they differ, it is unfair in its misrepresentation of their difference. The very forcible question of Dr. Buckland is not answered: and we may very safely affirm that on the Essayist's principles it never can be answered. All that Mr. Goodwin attempts is a poor effort to parry it, by telling us that it "is quite inapplicable to the real difficulty."⁵⁵ But this assertion is no better than its fellows: it is mere assertion, unsupported by argument, and (because directly contrary to fact), incapable of proof. Buckland's conviction of the perfect compatibility of Genesis and geology, as exhibited in the "Bridgewater Treatise," is similarly disposed of by Mr. Goodwin's *ipse dixit*: it "will not bear a moment's serious discussion." Archdeacon Pratt, however, thinks differently. He thinks Buckland's explanation "satisfactory;" and he tells you why: "it is a possible explanation," and "it meets the difficulties of the case." And these two propositions Mr. Goodwin has taken good care not to controvert. Nor is it Archdeacon Pratt alone who thinks that Buckland's explana-

⁵⁵ Essays and Reviews, p. 231.

⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 230.

tion meets the difficulties of the case ; Chalmers, Sedgwick, Kurtz, Birks, and a host of others, are all of the same mind. They all hold that "the days of Genesis are literal days ; that the ages of geology are silently passed over in the second verse ; and that the passage describes a great work of God, at the close of the Tertiary Period, by which our planet, after long ages, was finally prepared to be the habitation of man." What has Mr. Goodwin done to subvert this interpretation ? He has simply taken an exploded error of Hugh Miller's, and paraded it as if it were a complete proof of the untenability of the theory which he professes to regard as unable to bear a moment's serious discussion.

"Such a style of argument, where the truth of Scripture is in question, can hardly be too strongly condemned. It betrays, if not a settled purpose to damage the authority of the Bible by any artifice of special pleading, at least a total incapacity to discern the really vital points of the controversy, the true limits of authority, and the results of a wide and genuine induction of geological evidence. All that is true and beautiful in Hugh Miller's writings is cast aside ; and a solitary error, since disproved by the evidence of thirty eras and twenty thousand species, is stolen from him, and dipped in poison, that it may inflict a deadly wound on the faith which was dearest to his heart."

But even if this mistaken supposition of Hugh Miller did prove the untenability of the Chalmerian explanation, it would be still as far as ever from supporting the monstrous assertions of Mr. Goodwin : and no one knows this better than Mr. Goodwin himself. Hence the eagerness with which he attempts to discredit Miller where he cannot pervert him. No sooner does it appear that Miller is as determined as Chalmers himself to maintain the correctness of the literal Scripture than we are told, "It is difficult to acquit Hugh Miller of an equivocation here."⁵⁷ Not so : Hugh Miller was the last man to resort to equivocation ; and Mr. Goodwin should have been the last man to charge him with it.

In conclusion, let us observe the facts. The two divergent

⁵⁷ Essays and Reviews, p. 242, note.

⁵⁸ Ge. ii. 4.

schools of Miller and Chalmers are united in direct hostility to the assertions of Mr. Goodwin. They both hold the strict truthfulness and accuracy of the Mosaic narrative. They both hold that the occurrences of that narrative are optically described. But they differ in opinion as to the subordinate question—What was the length of the days of the Creative Week? Miller, seeing that the word “day” is frequently used by the Sacred Writers to denote a lengthened period (e.g. “the day of the Lord,” “the day of vengeance,” and in this very narrative⁵⁸ it is used to signify the whole time of the creative work,) adopted the Cuvierian expansion of the six days into geological periods. Yet the opposite view (of Chalmers) which regards each day as an ordinary period of twenty-four hours he was so far from regarding as absolutely untenable, that he had previously maintained it himself. Later geological researches, especially those of Murchison and D'Orbigny, have made it evident that the reason on which Hugh Miller based his change of opinion was founded on mistake. The facts and arguments by which this mistake is demonstrated Mr. Goodwin has not ventured to touch. The result is evident: “the Bucklandian hypothesis” is still in possession of the field; it is still “satisfactory;” for it still “meets the difficulties of the case.”

Equally evident is Mr Goodwin's discomfiture. Hear his own account of the matter. “Buckland's theory supposes that previous to the appearance of the present races of animals and vegetables there was a great gap in the globe's history; that the earth was completely depopulated, as well of marine as land animals, and that the creation of all existing plants and animals was coeval with that of man. This theory is by no means supported by geological phenomena, and is now, we suppose, rejected by all geologists whose authority is valuable.”

Now compare this positive assertion with the statement of Dr. Lardner, based on the labours of Murchison and D'Orbigny. “By careful analyses of the strata and the animal remains, geologists have ascertained with a high degree of probability, if not with absolute moral certainty, that subsequently to the first appearance of the forms of animal life, which took place after the fourth great convulsion of our globe, there were at least twenty-eight successive convulsions of a like nature, each of

which was attended with the complete destruction of the animals and plants which existed on the globe. In fine, after the latest of these catastrophes, when the last strata of the Tertiary period were deposited, *the most recent exertion of Creative Power took place, and the globe was peopled with the tribes which now inhabit it, including the human race.*

“The disruption of the earth’s crust, through which the chain of the great Alps was forced up to its present elevation, which, according to M. D’Orbigny, was simultaneous with that which forced up the Chilian Andes, a chain which extends over three thousand miles of western continent, terminated the Tertiary age, and preceded immediately the creation of the human race and its concomitant tribes. The waters of the seas and oceans, lifted from their beds by this immense perturbation, swept over the continents with irresistible force, destroying the entire fauna and flora of the last Tertiary period, and burying its ruins in the deposits that ensued. By this dislocation, Europe underwent a complete change of form. Secondary effects followed, which have left their traces on every part of the earth’s surface. When the seas had settled into their new beds, and the outlines of the land were permanently defined, the latest and greatest act of creation was accomplished, by clothing the earth with the vegetation that now covers it, peopling the land and water with the animal tribes which now exist, and calling into being the human race.”⁵⁹

From this comparison nothing can be more evident that that Mr. Goodwin’s statement “exactly reverses the real truth with regard to the latest conclusions of geology. With the failure of its foundation, the whole fabric of sceptical inference reared upon it falls at once into ruins.” And on those ruins we may fitly transcribe a single sentence from another place:—“The short account of the Creation given in the first chapter of Genesis, is in accordance with the results of geological discovery in as complete a manner as would be possible in so brief a summary.”⁶⁰

So much for Mr. Goodwin’s geology: but what of himself? “His assault upon the truth and credibility of Scripture is arrogant; his reasonings and his array of proofs are weak and

⁵⁹ Museum of Science and Art, xii., p. 552.

⁶⁰ Ibid. xi., p. 71.

unavailing. Remove from his argument that portion which consists of the conflict of Buckland with Miller, and what remains? Nothing of the slightest weight. That which is properly *his own*, his comparison of geological facts with the testimony of Scripture, is too weak and ineffective to stagger a child.”⁶¹

The review of the whole subject is well calculated to inspire both caution and confidence: increased caution in discriminating between the text of Scripture and our interpretation of it; and renewed confidence in the unerring veracity of Scripture itself. Our interpretation can never be entirely free from that fallibility which attaches to all that is human; but the Word which we interpret, like its Divine Author, is one “that cannot lie.” It is by the variety of human interpretations that men are “carried about with divers and strange doctrines;” the Law and the Testimony, stamped with the immutability of Him who gave it, is “the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.” The Text is sublime and steadfast as the everlasting hills; the Commentary is the mere reflection of the bright or shady clouds that fleet across their summits. That vast sphere in which sun moon and stars revolve, the Text calls “the Expanse;” it was the Comment, embodying a mistaken popular opinion, that called that expanse, “a firmament.” The text tells us that matter is not eternal; it is the comment that has found in that statement the date of the creation of man. These instances few will be disposed to challenge; but how many still remain in which although the text and the comment are equally diverse, the readers are not many, who have learnt to distinguish things that differ! May it not be serviceable to glance at some of these?

Timid believers, (if that be not a misnomer,) those who *doubt*, i.e. those for whom especially this chapter is written, have perhaps an occasional misgiving as to both the extent and the manner of its scientific teaching. Would it not have been better (because more demonstrative of supernaturalism) if the Bible had been *evidently* in advance of the science of the age?

⁶¹ Christian Observer: vol. lix., p. 395.

Or again, leaving the *matter* just as it is, would it not have been better if the manner of expression had been more precisely scientific, less popular, i.e. inexact? No, it would not have been better; it would have been worse every way. Take the first case; in which the Bible is to be "*evidently* in advance of the age." Of what age? Of every age to the end of the world? Then would a professed Revelation from God become an unintelligible Riddle to all mankind. Of some intermediate age? Then it would not be in advance of the ages following. Suppose the Bible had contained a description of the earth's fluid nucleus, of primary rocks, of the flora of the coal measures, or of the extinct animals of the Secondary and Tertiary periods: what then? what proof of wisdom could it be to the men whose age pronounced it utterly unintelligible, or to the men whose age pronounced it antiquated and common-place?

Take the second supposition, and you "turn the first page of Scripture into a riddle, unintelligible to all former ages, and hardly to be understood, except by one person in a thousand, even in our own days." We should then read pretty much as follows:—"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. And first, God said, Let there be immense oceans of nebulous matter, scattered throughout all space; and it was so. And God said, Let the central portion of each heap of mist condense into a sun, and the smaller portions condense into planets, and let the planets revolve each around its own sun; and it was so. And God said, Let one planet of one sun condense into solid matter, and become liquid with intense heat; and it was so. And God called the planet earth, and the central body it revolved around he called the sun; and it was so." . . . But why restrict ourselves to hypothetical illustration when the actual is within our reach? Fact is both stranger and stronger than fiction; and those who imagine that the sublime simplicity of narration which compelled the admiration of Longinus would have been still more sublime if it had stalked forth on a stilted diction of this sort, may judge of their own ideal as it appears in a recent version which has been given to the world for this very end. Dr. Pratt (let no one confound him with the Archdeacon!) has published a translation of the Mosaic Narrative with the express object of

"shewing the general scientific accuracy of the Cosmogony of Moses."⁶² He tells us that he takes the unpointed Hebrew Text as the true one; and considers the pointed text as a version. From the unpointed text, then, Dr. Pratt derives this idea of the meaning of Genesis i. 3-6:—"And God said, Let there be volcanic action, and there was volcanic action; and God saw the volcanic action that it was good; and God distinguished between the volcanic action and between the inertia, and God called the volcanic action 'The Active Condition,' and the inertia he called 'The Passive Condition.' And it was redistributive, and it was developmental, the first formation." On which we⁶³ say "that the *last* formation, that of Dr. Pratt, is the most redistributive and the most developmental we have ever seen. We now leave him to our readers: he does not at all shake our conviction that the ordinary translations of the first chapters of Genesis come as close to the author's meaning, or very nearly as close, as he himself could have done, if he had written in a modern language."

What remains to be said on this subject cannot be better said than in the very pertinent words of a new preface to an old book. "I affirm that the inspired Word is so framed as to be found consistent with the science and literature of ages long posterior to its own. This is the very point and pith of my argument. I put it as a problem which only the Omniscient can solve,—How a revelation which is to range over centuries of comparative ignorance on matters of secular and mundane science,—and is necessarily, according to its plan, to mix up these matters freely with its higher themes,—is to be so constructed and so recorded that it shall not anticipate human discoveries, and yet shall be in entire harmony with them as in the course of time they emerge. I maintain that this precise problem is found actually solved, in point of fact, in the Bible. And I draw the inference that this implies its plenary, verbal inspiration. The reason is plain enough, according to my view. Only One seeing the end from the beginning could so adjust the language used as, on the one hand, to make it tell

⁶² "The Genealogy of Creation:" by H. F. A. Pratt, M.D. (Churchill.)

⁶³ Athenæum, June 29, 1861.

the men of the existing generation no more than they otherwise knew of astronomical, or geological, or other natural truth ; and yet, on the other hand, to make it such that the men of all future generations should be able in the long run, and without violence, to explain it satisfactorily in the light of their clearer and fuller information, and their more advanced and accurate science.”⁶⁴

Akin to the error which identifies the antiquity of man with the antiquity of the globe on which he lives, is the error which identifies the death of the human race with the death of the inferior animals. This identification is not in the text ; it is to be traced to the commentary alone. I am perfectly aware that in making this statement I incur the hostility of two classes of opponents directly opposed to each other. On the one hand are those who hold the integrity of the Bible, and who still cling to the traditional idea because they believe it to be the doctrine of the Bible. On the other hand are those who eagerly seize the admission that this is the doctrine of the Bible, because this admission furnishes them with their most unanswerable argument against the integrity of that Bible. The doctrine itself they know to be unfounded and false ; only grant then, that the Bible teaches it, and you grant that the Bible is as fallible as “any other book.” It is thus that from the most directly opposite motives, both these hostile parties are agreed to maintain that the doctrine of “Death before the Fall” is incompatible with the teaching of the Bible. And it is against them both, that I shall here briefly specify a few reasons for believing the contrary of this proposition to be true.

First, as to the fact : second, as to the doctrine.

It is an unquestionable fact that in the oldest of the sedimentary rocks, the remains of animals are found in vast numbers. Through the whole series, increasing as we ascend, we find similar remains : but it is not until we reach the very highest stratum, the mere superficial coat of alluvium, that we find the remains of man. Will any one maintain that none of these

⁶⁴ Dr. Candlish : In Preface to new edition of “ Reason and Revelation ; ” 1864.

animals preceded man in the period of their existence ? Then why are the remains of man not found with theirs ? for his bony skeleton is as likely to be preserved and petrified as theirs. Besides, we have the testimony of physiology and comparative anatomy⁶⁵ to the fact that the divergence between the ancient (fossilized) races of animals, and those now existing, is so great that both could not exist cotemporaneously, in a world adapted to either. But waving this argument (not as being less weighty but as being less evident), I fall back upon the fact, that out of the ten thousand species of animals dug out of the rocks beneath alluvium, no relic of man has been found ; and I ask how that fact is to be satisfactorily explained, except by the admission that man was not their cotemporary.

Take another fact. The same great system of organization and adaptation which now prevails, was no less prevalent in those remote ages when the fossil animals were living beings. The large tribes of carnivorous animals now in existence are provided, as we all know, with organs expressly designed to enable them to inflict on other animals violent and painful death. Exactly similar tribes, and in a like proportion, are found among the fossil animals. And further, that animals of such an organization not only lived in the ages anterior to man, but actually destroyed cotemporary species, is proved by the discovery of the remains of one animal enclosed in the body of another—the destroyer and its prey alike transmuted into solid rock ; an enduring memorial, testifying to the most sceptical, that death existed among animals before man's transgression.

Such then is the testimony of Science as to the fact. Is this

⁶⁵ "Judging by these indications of the habits of the animals," says the distinguished anatomist Sir Charles Bell, "we acquire a knowledge of the condition of the earth during their period of existence ; that it was suited at one time to the scaly tribe of the *lacertæ* with languid motion ; at another, to animals of higher organization with more varied and lively habits ; and finally, we learn

that at any period previous to man's creation, the surface of the earth would have been unsuitable to him. Any other hypothesis than that of a new creation of animals, suited to the successive changes in the inorganic matter of the globe, the condition of the water, atmosphere, and temperature, brings with it only an accumulation of difficulties."—*The Hand, its Mechanism* : pp. 31, 115.

fact opposed to the doctrine of Holy Scripture? Not at all. That it is opposed to the traditional interpretation of Scripture is indeed fully admitted; but then to that interpretation Scripture itself is also opposed: and thus, in this instance, as in so many others, Scripture and Science, so far from being at variance, are at one. When Scripture speaks of death as being the consequence of sin, it speaks of the death of the human race alone. By a violent dislocation of Scripture—i.e., by interpreting Scripture *unlike* any other book—we may indeed obtain general expressions which seem to include all organic natures. Thus, e.g., if we merely say “By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin:” But if we finish the sentence we shall see that the death spoken of is expressly limited to man, and to man in the character of a sinner:—“And so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.”⁶⁶ Upon all MEN—in the capacity of sinners; but not therefore upon plants and animals which are incapable of sin. Similarly, in the declaration that “since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead,” the last clause of the sentence limits the meaning to the human family.⁶⁷ And in the reason assigned for this declaration, the same limitation appears even more explicitly:—“For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.” It might be sufficient here, to note the undeniable fact that St. Paul’s argument throughout the whole chapter relates to the human race solely and exclusively; but even those who cling to the notion that the death brought in by Adam was entailed on every kind of life, may well hesitate to adopt the inevitable conclusion, that the life brought in by Christ includes, in like manner, all organic natures. He who can contemplate the exuberance of life attested by everything around us—the coral reefs of the Pacific, the great plateau of the Atlantic, the chalk and other formations nearer home, the myriads of tiny ephemera warmed into life by every summer sun, the animalculæ that sport in a single drop of water, the mysterious zoophytes, the noxious parasites, the infusoria and the entozoa;—who, reflecting on the prolific character of individual species, perceives the inconceivable immu-

⁶⁶ Ro. v. 12.

⁶⁷ 1 Co. xv. 21.

merability of the aggregate of every individual of every species ; who, having thus learned to apprehend the myriad forms, the countless multitudes, that are included in the sum of animated nature, can yet expect a resurrection for every one of them ;—such a one (if such a one there be) is not the one with whom I have here any controversy. The controversy lies with those who while they are unable to admit a resurrection of this sort, are equally unable to show cause for rejecting it. To such, we have a right to say—Be consistent : maintain, if you please, the absolute universality of the death which came by Adam, and with it, maintain too, the similar universality of the life that came by Christ. Or, if you restrict the resurrection to the human race alone, apply the same restriction to the death which made that resurrection necessary. You may accept either alternative : but you cannot embrace both. If you abide by the declaration of Scripture, all is consistent and clear. The resurrection is for those bodies only, which have been the dwelling-place of soul. God is the Father of spirits : and “there is a spirit in man.” Not the mere “spirit of the beast which goeth downward,” but “the spirit of man that goeth upward,” even the “breath of the Almighty” (for that it is) which giveth him understanding. Thus, in Christ shall all *men* be made alive ; and similarly, in Adam, did all *men* die. Co-extensive with the death is the resurrection. So saith the Scripture. “As” is the one : “even so” is the other. The truth of God in Scripture, and that truth in Science are in perfect harmony. The discord is of our own making—when we make the word of God of none effect by our tradition.

But I go further. The scientific doctrine of “Death before the Fall” is not only not contradicted, it is positively supported, by the declaration of Scripture. Thus, even in that brief record of the first sin, its sentence, and execution, which we find in the earliest pages of the Bible, we are told that “Unto Adam also and to his wife did the Lord God make coats of skins, and clothed them.”⁶⁸ The traditional interpretation has been a good deal puzzled to account for these skins at this early period. “It is probable,” says Boothroyd, “as animals were not used

⁶⁸ Ge. iii. 21.

for food previous to the deluge, that sacrifices were now instituted, and that the skins with which our first parents were clothed, were those of the victims which had been offered to God." "It is supposed," says Matthew Henry, "that they were slain not for food but for sacrifice." Scott adopts the same view, and pronounces it "extremely probable;" for, says he, as Adam and Eve "certainly had never slain any animals before the Fall, and as we have no reason to suppose that any had died of themselves, it is hard to conceive in what other way these skins could be procured." But although he pronounces it "extremely probable," he classes it with "all other opinions on the subject" as being "mere conjecture." It is not difficult to perceive however, that his conjecture would have been of a very different kind if he had had what we possess—i.e., abundant "reason to suppose" that any animals had previously died of themselves. On the very face of it the narrative seems to imply this: for they "certainly" had not been slain, and yet they had died. But the fiction of no death before the Fall being seriously believed, without question, without examination, and even without evidence; this other fiction of sacrifice thus early, seemed necessary to account for the existence of an undeniable fact, which the traditional interpretation found it not easy otherwise to explain.

Those who still find it difficult to receive this doctrine, will do well to ponder the fact established by physiology, that death is a general law of organic natures. For dead organic matter is essential to the support and nourishment of living beings.⁶⁸ Admit, for the sake of argument, (although in respect to the carnivorous races the admission is absurd) that animals might be supported by vegetable food. Yet how could animals feed on plants without destroying, as they now do, multitudes of minute insects and animalculæ? Without death, how could

^{68†} " See dying vegetables life sustain,
See life dissolving vegetate again:
All forms that perish other forms supply,
(By turns we catch the vital breath, and die,)
Like bubbles on the sea of Matter borne,
They rise, they break, and to that sea return."

Essay on Man : Ep. III. ll. 15—20.

the multiplication of animals be arrested? those animals whose multiplication was impressed upon them as a law of their nature—a law of blessing—a law before sin, and even before man? Yet, if not arrested, what could prevent the world from becoming too full? or the supply of food from becoming too scanty? To the existing system, death is as essential as gravitation, and apparently just as much a law of nature.

To this it will be answered, that the existing system is not the original system. That apart from the effects of the fall upon man himself—

“Discord first,
Daughter of Sin, among the irrational
Death introduced, through fierce antipathy ;
Beast now with beast 'gan war, and fowl with fowl,
And fish with fish : to graze the herb all leaving,
Devoured each other.”⁶⁹

We reply, this is merely an ideal assertion. There is no more shadow of evidence for it than for its parallel—

“Some say he bid his angels turn askance
The poles of earth, twice ten degrees and more,
From the sun's axle ; they with labour push'd
Oblique the centric globe.”

“Some say”—yes, many. But if we must at all treat with mere suppositions, we certainly prefer those which are supported by fact to those which fact subverts. Of this kind there are three—*independent, but not inconsistent*,—by any of which, all seeming discrepancy between Scripture and Science may be removed.

The first is that of Dr. Pye Smith, who says, “In the state of pristine purity, the bodily constitution of man was exempted from the law of progress towards dissolution, which belonged to the inferior animals.” The forfeit of this enviable distinction was the penalty of disobedience. In favour of this view there is a strong presumptive argument. For if man did not thus stand exempted from decay and death reigning around him, what weight or meaning could he attach to the penalty? What idea could he have of its nature, if he had seen nothing of its

⁶⁹ *Paradise Lost* : B. x.

operation? And we may be sure that God never promulgates a penalty without affording his subjects the means of comprehending it. A strong confirmation of this view is furnished also by the history of the tree of life that grew in the garden of Eden.

The second was amply illustrated by Jeremy Taylor, long before geology had any existence. "That death," says the pious bishop, "which God threatened to Adam, and which passed upon his posterity, is not the going out of this world, but the manner of going. . . . When he fell, then he began to die; the same day, (God said, and that must needs be true;) and therefore, it must mean upon that very day he fell into an evil and dangerous condition, a state of change and affliction; then death began; that is, man began to die by a natural diminution, and aptness to disease and misery. . . . Death is not an action, but a whole state and condition; and this was first brought in upon us by the offence of one man." More recently this view has been substantially adopted by some of our ablest theologians.⁷⁰ They take the "death" penalty of disobedience as extending to much more than mere physical death in the ordinary sense. They believe it to be a generic term, including all penal evils. And certainly, this interpretation seems in perfect agreement with the Scriptural declaration that "our Saviour Jesus Christ" "by the Gospel" "hath abolished death:" abolished it by plucking out its "sting."⁷¹

The third view of the subject traces the origin of death to the divine plan of the creation. Those who hold it, maintain that, man's apostasy being necessarily foreknown, God, in the beginning, adapted every other being and event in the world to the character and condition which he foresaw would soon be that of man. Had the original constitution of things been otherwise, the change to a state of decay and death, introduced by sin, would have amounted to an entirely new creation. Yet, as the constitution of the world is (and, on this view, always was,) very different from what it would have been if sin had never entered it, and as man alone is capable of sin, it is proper

⁷⁰ See Chalmers's *Lectures on Romans*, Lect. xxvi; Stuart and Hodge on *Ro. v. 12*; and Harris's "Man Primeval," p. 178.

⁷¹ 2 Ti. i. 10; 1 Co. xv. 54, 55.

to regard man's transgression as the actual cause of all the suffering and death that have ever existed on our globe.

Any one of these theories is sufficient to show the entire agreement between Scripture and Science; ⁷² but the last is eminently so. It agrees with physiology and experience in representing death to be a law of all organic nature on the globe. It accords with Revelation in showing how this law may be the result of man's apostasy. And with geology it harmonizes in showing how death might have reigned over animals and plants before man's existence.

Another very possible error of this sort may perhaps be found lurking under the popular interpretation which affirms the absolute universality of The Deluge. I do not pronounce this interpretation to be a demonstrable, but only a possible error. I am well aware, indeed, what fate I shall incur for speaking of it even thus gently. There are still but too many persons who affirm, with a peculiar significance of their own, that "to give up The Deluge is to give up the Bible." But this, I too, affirm. I affirm more. I affirm that the sure way to endanger the Bible is to substitute one's preconceived idea of the Deluge, for the Scriptural account of the Deluge.

As to the fact of a general deluge, there is no question whatever. It is a fact which the stoutest opponents of the Bible will not dare to gainsay, in the face of the universal tradition by which it is attested. And the universality of that tradition is not easily accounted for, except by the admission that the Scriptural account of the preservation of a single family is true. ⁷³ The declarations of history are confirmed too, by the discoveries of geology, which shew us that in the elevation and subsidence of mountains and continents, and in volcanic agency generally, we have an adequate cause for extensive, if not universal deluges. Thus, it is one of the most eminent and judicious of all geologists, (Professor Sedg-

⁷² They are treated more largely in Prof. Hitchcock's "Religion of Geology;" pp. 87—102.

⁷³ See the array of ancient witnesses to the truth of the

Deluge marshalled by Grotius ("De Veritate Rel. Christ." lib. I. c. xvi), and by Faber ("Horæ Mosaicæ" pp. 98—123).

wick,⁷⁴) who says, "If we have the clearest proofs of great oscillations of sea level, and have a right to make use of them, while we seek to explain some of the latest phenomena of geology, may we not reasonably suppose, that, within the period of human history, similar oscillations have taken place in those parts of Asia which were the cradle of our race, and may have produced that destruction among the early families of men, which is described in our sacred books, and of which so many traditions have been brought down to us through all the streams of authentic history?"⁷⁵ "Nay, some, who have examined Armenia, have thought they found there a deposit which could be referred to the deluge of Noah; but I have no access to any facts on this point."⁷⁶ The truth is, that geologically that region still remains very partially and superficially explored.

Geology then, furnishes a powerful argument in favor of a partial deluge; i.e. a deluge universal as to the region inhabited by man, though not universal as to the entire globe. It is the supposition of a deluge absolutely universal, that is encumbered by so many difficulties. The most obvious of these is found in the fact that the quantity of water necessary to cover "all the high hills that were under the whole heaven," would be eight times as great as that which now exists upon our globe. A second difficulty is that of providing room in the ark for the pairs and septuples of "every living thing of all flesh." In the calculations which have been made with a view to remove this difficulty, the number of existing species has been assumed to be not more than a few hundreds; whereas, the actual number already described by zoologists is not less than a hundred and fifty thousand; "and the probable number existing on the globe is not less than half a million."⁷⁷ But

⁷⁴ Nor he alone: Hugh Miller, with equal force and eloquence, has maintained the same views.

⁷⁵ Geology of the Lake District: p. 14.

⁷⁶ Prof. Hitchcock: Religion of Geology, p. 114.

⁷⁷ "And for the greater part of these must provision have been made, since most of them inhabit

either the air or the dry land. A thousand species of mammalia, six thousand species of birds, and two thousand species of reptiles, and one hundred and twenty thousand species of insects are already described, and must have been provided with space and food. Will any one believe this possible, in a vessel not more than four

the third and most important objection to this universality of the deluge is derived from the facts brought to light by modern science respecting "centres of creation," and the distribution of animals and plants. Naturalists now reckon a large number of botanical and zoological districts, or provinces, within which they find certain peculiar groups of animals and plants, with natures exactly adapted to their respective districts, but incapable of enduring the different climate of adjoining districts. The idea of the collection before the deluge, or of the dispersion after it, of species so varied, by natural means, is not one which can be readily entertained. Rejecting this, "three courses are open to us." We may have recourse to a miracle. We may suppose a new creation to have taken place after the flood. Or we may admit that flood to have been not absolutely universal.

The first course will be preferred by many. But it is noteworthy that the sacred writer attributes the deluge to the operation of natural causes—the forty-days rain-fall, and the overflowing of the ocean. The subsidence of the waters is in like manner attributed to the agency of natural causes:—"God made a wind to pass over the earth;" the fountains of the deep were stopped, "and the rain from heaven was restrained." If we are to maintain that every part of the event was strictly miraculous, then we must give up philosophizing about it.⁷⁸

hundred and fifty feet long, seventy-five feet broad, and forty-five feet high?" (Religion of Geology: p. 116.)

⁷⁸ There is no question as to what God *could* do: the question is—What does the Inspired Record justify us in believing that He *did*? If a miracle were necessary to supply the overwhelming waters,—if it were necessary in order to collect, or to disperse the animals preserved,—if even an absolutely universal deluge would (from the limited dimensions of the ark) involve the necessity of a subsequent creation,—if, (from the same cause) it were ne-

cessary that some one of the species should subsist without food;—to all this there is indeed a most sufficient answer: With Him to whom "all things are possible," the miraculous is as easy as the natural.

But though this answer be most sufficient it is not therefore most satisfactory. It is a possible, but not a probable solution of the difficulty. It is not probable because it is not sustained by the Bible narrative. It is directly opposed to that narrative. It accounts by miracle for that which the Bible assigns to the operation of natural causes: and it is

But the agency of natural causes expressly asserted by the sacred writer seems to militate against this assumption. Nor does the second supposition seem more probable. For if we admit a new creation after the deluge, why should there be such great care to preserve the various species through the deluge? We are driven therefore, to the last alternative: the Deluge was not absolutely universal.

Is this conclusion contrary to Scripture? By no means. It is contrary only to a hasty and mistaken interpretation of Scripture. In all ages and nations, but especially in those of antiquity, “universal terms are often used to signify only a very large amount in number or quantity.” The Hebrew **בָּמָלֵךְ**, the Greek **πᾶς**, and the English **all**, are alike thus used as equivalent to *many*. Instances of a popular usage abounding everywhere, are not wanting in the Bible. On the contrary, they are there both numerous and striking. To take a single instance, in which this limitation is imposed by the context itself:—In the account of the plagues of Egypt, we are told that “the hail smote every herb of the field, and brake every tree of the field;” but in a few days afterwards, it is said of the locusts that “they did eat of every herb of the land, and all the fruit of the trees which the hail had left.” Passages of this sort⁷⁹ are so numerous, and, at the same time, so obviously analogous to those which describe the extent of the Deluge, that long before the discoveries of geology, or those of Dr. Prichard and his successors in the field of natural history, there were not wanting distinguished writers who, on exegetical grounds alone, regarded the Deluge as limited.

founded on an interpretation of the terms of that narrative confessedly inadmissible in all similar and analogous instances.

On the one hand therefore, we may adopt the popular interpretation, and then imagine a chain of miracles on which to suspend it. On the other, we may interpret the universal terms here used, in the limited sense in which they are unquestionably employed

elsewhere, and then all difficulty is at an end. Which is the wiser of these two courses, is a question on which there will probably still be two opinions. But which is the more consistent interpretation—consistent with the rest of the narrative, with universal usage, and especially with the usage of the Bible itself—on this question there can hardly be more than one.

⁷⁹ Cf. Ge. xli. 57, “All countries.”

Thus wrote Bishop Stillingfleet, above a hundred and fifty years ago:—"I cannot see any urgent necessity from the Scripture to assert that the flood did spread over all the surface of the earth. That all mankind, those in the ark excepted, were destroyed by it, is most certain, according to the Scriptures. The flood was universal as to mankind; but from thence follows no necessity at all of asserting the universality of it as to the globe of the earth, unless it be sufficiently proved that the whole earth was peopled before the flood, which I despair of ever seeing proved."⁸⁰ Nearly fifty years before Stillingfleet, Matthew Poole had said—"It is not to be supposed that the entire globe of the earth was covered with water. Where was the need of overwhelming those regions in which there were no human beings? It would be highly unreasonable to suppose that mankind had so increased before the deluge as to have penetrated to all the corners of the earth. It is indeed not probable that they had extended themselves beyond the limits of Syria and Mesopotamia. Absurd it would be to affirm that the effects of the punishment inflicted upon men alone applied to places in which there were no men. If then we should entertain the belief that not so much as the hundredth part of the globe was overspread with water, still the deluge would be universal, because the extirpation took effect upon all the part of the globe which was inhabited. If we take this ground the difficulties which some have raised about the deluge fall away as inapplicable, and mere cavils; and irreligious persons have no reason left them for doubting the truth of the Holy Scriptures."⁸¹ And to take but a single witness on the same side, from among more modern writers, Dr. Pye Smith, equally eminent for his learning and candour, after treating the subject at some length, thus concludes;—"From these instances of the Scriptural idiom in the application of phraseology similar to

i.e. those contiguous to Egypt. 2 Ch. ix. 23, "All the kings of the earth." Ac. ii. 5, "Every nation under heaven:" i.e., as we learn from the enumeration following, those of a region extending from Italy to Persia, and from Egypt to

the Euxine. Ac. x. 12, "All manner of four-footed beasts:" i.e., a great variety; but not literally all the species of terrestrial vertebrata.

⁸⁰ *Origines Sacrae* : B. III. ch. iv.

⁸¹ "Synopsis," on Ge. vii. 19.

that in the narrative concerning the flood, I humbly think that those terms do not oblige us to understand a literal universality; so that we are exonerated from some otherwise insuperable difficulties in natural history and geology. If so much of the earth was overflowed as was occupied by the human race, both the physical and the moral ends of that awful visitation were answered.”⁸²

A wise caution will discriminate, therefore, between the Mosaic account of the Deluge, and the popular interpretation of that account. The history of that interpretation is most instructive. The physico-theological school at one time felt certain that no other theory but an entire dissolution of the crust of the globe at the Deluge, could possibly be made consistent with the Bible.⁸³ More recently, it has been supposed equally necessary in order to reconcile geology and revelation, that we should admit the ante-diluvian continents to have sunk beneath the ocean.⁸⁴ Still later, it has been thought quite certain that the surface of the earth bore the most striking marks of a universal deluge, probably identical with that of Scripture.⁸⁵ At length, while, on the one hand, the extreme opinion is now generally reached, that no trace of the deluge of Noah remains; on the other, the old opinion is again beginning to be entertained, that the Deluge was literally universal.⁸⁶ And equally

⁸² Scripture and Geology: p. 214.

⁸³ Thus even so eminent a writer as The Rev. W. Kirby, following the fancies of Catcott and Hutchinson, interprets “the windows of heaven” to mean cracks and volcanic rents in the earth, through which air and water rushed inwardly and outwardly with such violence as to tear the crust to pieces.

⁸⁴ Yet two, at least, of the rivers of Eden are still in existence. To meet this fatal objection to their theory, Penn and Fairholme actually attempt to discredit that part of the Bible which describes

the situation of Eden. It could not be authentic, because forsooth, it would destroy their theory!

⁸⁵ And this opinion may possibly turn out to be the true one, after all. For “the glacial theory” which has displaced it, is by no means a satisfactory solution of the various problems suggested by the actual phenomena of the drift.

⁸⁶ Thus speaks—no mean authority—Dr. Wilson, in his recent work already quoted. He maintains that we have minimized the antediluvian era. “But even at the lowest computation the interval between the creation of man

wide and well-established is the belief that, amid all these fluctuations of theory, the Bible has stood as an immoveable rock amid the conflicting waves. In the midst of human opinions, veering to every point of the compass, the Divine Record has ever remained fixed and true to the one point alone. Let it but be interpreted consistently with the laws of language, and its own consistency immediately appears. Can this be said of the Vedahs, or the Koran ?

Another subject for caution is that of the Biblical chronology. In the words of "The Athenæum," "Sir Charles Lyell's volume is an elaborate assault on the popular chronology, bringing the matter to this issue: either the scientific or the popular chronology must be wrong." If the evidence adduced by Sir Charles "be abundant and well established, if the proofs be impregnable and the ordering of them unimpeachable, then the world must yield assent to them, however reluctant it may be to abandon a long-received view."

and the deluge, was not very much less than the whole Christian era ; it was longer than the whole mediæval period marked by the rise of Mahometanism, Feudalism and the Crusades ; and the brief interval since the discovery of North America, during which our little insular Britain has proved the nursery of nations is little more than a third of the allotted years of one of the antediluvian patriarchs."

He regards the continuance of the whole human family before the flood around its old eastern birth-land, as a "wholly gratuitous assumption." He puts aside Hugh Miller's "eloquent ingenuity" in supposing the deluge to have been limited to a comparatively circumscribed area, as more fitted to please the imagina-

tion than to satisfy the reason ; and says—

" Now that it seems almost certainly demonstrable, on archæological and also on geological grounds, that the human family was widely dispersed on the face of the earth, at the earliest possible date at which we can reconcile chronologies of science and revelation, possibly some may be tempted to return to their old convictions, that when *all the fountains of the great deep were broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened and the rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights, and the waters prevailed exceedingly upon the earth, and all the high hills that were under the whole heaven were covered, it actually was so.*" (Pre-historic Man : vol. 1, pp. 117, 118.)

Undoubtedly :—“if!” But waving this “if,” for the moment ; let us consider the supposable case in which the world would feel itself compelled to abandon the long-received view. What then ? would that be equivalent to an abandonment of the Bible, or only of the long-received interpretation of the Bible ? The answer to this question would not be doubtful in the case of those who have learned that “The Foundation standeth sure,” and “The Scripture cannot be broken.” But since the two are separable, why not call them so ? The chronological data furnished by the Bible are one thing ; the calculations based thereon are a very different thing :—*how* different, the varieties of interpretation indisputably prove. These varied and conjectural computations are not even all founded on the same basis. Some of the chronologers abide by the Hebrew text ; others prefer the LXX ;⁸⁷ some proceed as if they found everywhere the same elements of certainty ; others restrict the alleged *uncertainty* to the antediluvian period ; and but few who do not take into their calculations somewhere or other, some unknown or variable quantity. Surely then, we may say of the chronology of the Bible what Dr. Buckland said of its geology : The question is not one concerning the correctness of the Inspired Record, but only concerning our interpretation of it. Dr. Prichard’s variable quantity is an instance in point. “The Hebrew chronology,” says he, “may be computed with accuracy to the era of the building of the Temple, or at least to that of the division of the tribes. In the interval between that date and the arrival of Abraham in Palestine, it cannot be ascertained with exactness, but may be computed with a near approximation to truth.” So far, well. But then he adds :—“Beyond that event we can never know how many centuries,

⁸⁷ Those who weigh the reasons for this preference given in “Wall’s Crit. Notes on the O. T.,” in Kennicott’s Gen. Diss., or in his “Remarks on Select Passages in the Old Testament,” will hardly hesitate to agree with Bp. Stillingfleet, that “Those chronologers who much streighten those times,

are not the best friends to the credibility of Scripture history ; or with Warburton (in his “View of Lord Bolingbroke’s Philosophy,”) that “THE BEST chronologers agree, in preferring the Samaritan, the LXX., and Josephus, to the Hebrew copy.”

nor even how many chiliads of years, may have elapsed since the first man of clay received the image of God, and the breath of life.”⁸⁸ Dr. Wilson’s conclusion is as much more modest as it is more recent. “Conflicting versions,” he says, “lend additional countenance to long-cherished doubts as to whether the received chronology, deduced from their genealogical data, does not greatly abridge the actual ante-diluvian human era.”⁸⁹ Surely, then, we shall do well, in discriminating between the sacred chronology and its many computers, to exercise a wise caution.

Corresponding to our caution will be our confidence. Having once made ourselves sure of the real meaning of Scripture, we may rest in full assurance that not one word shall fail. That confidence is more than justified by the history of the past; and in adverting to that history in this place I will content myself with instancing these three particulars:—First, There has been no wresting of Scripture to make it agree with Science; Second, The attempt to overthrow Scripture by the aid of Science, has turned out a ridiculous failure; and Third, Between Science and Scripture the agreement is so uniform and so complete, so marked and so minute, as of itself to demonstrate the absolute, verbal, plenary Inspiration, of “all Scripture.”

As to the first. It is sometimes pretended that those interpretations of Scripture which show it to be in harmony with the ascertained facts of Science, are not fair interpretations. They are said to be non-natural; perversions; contortions; inventions; accommodations; subtle (or clumsy) devices to evade a difficulty and prop up a dogma. Now if these said interpretations had never been heard of before our own days, this indictment might seem to be not altogether without cause. But the contrary is the case; and because it is so, the charge falls to the ground. This has been already shown in some instances; *e.g.*, in those which relate to “Death before the Fall,” and the universality of the Deluge. It appears even still more plainly

⁸⁸ Researches into the Physical History of Mankind: Vol. V., Note *ad fin.*

⁸⁹ Pre-historic Man: vol. 1., p. 117.

in that instance where it is with most effrontery denied:—the modern doctrine of geology. It is now exactly sixty years since Dr. Chalmers in his Lectures at St Andrews pronounced the truth (then commonly overlooked,) now almost universally received—“The writings of Moses do not fix the antiquity of the globe.” “The detailed history of creation in the first chapter of Genesis, begins at the middle of the second verse; and what precedes might be understood as an introductory sentence. . . Between the initial act and the details of Genesis, the world, for aught we know, might have been the theatre of many revolutions, the traces of which geology may still investigate.” But a hundred years before Chalmers, Bp. Patrick had written substantially the same thing:—“How long all things continued in mere confusion after the chaos was created, before light was extracted from it, we are not told. It might have been for anything that is here revealed, a great while.”⁹⁰ And centuries before Bishop Patrick, the most distinguished of the fathers, held the same views. Augustin, Theodoret and others, supposed the first verse of Genesis to describe the creation of matter, distinct from, and prior to, the work of the six days. Justin Martyr, and Gregory Nazianzen, believed in an indefinite period between the creation of matter and the subsequent arrangement of all things. Still more explicit are Basil, Cæsarius and Origen.

“The interval,” says Bishop Horsley, “between the production of the matter of the chaos and the formation of light, is undescribed and unknown.” “By the phrase ‘In the beginning,’ ” says Doederlin, “the time is declared when something began to be. But when God produced this remarkable work, Moses does not precisely define.” To the same effect speaks Sharon Turner: “We do not know, and we have no means of knowing, at what point of the ever-flowing eternity of that which is alone eternal, the divine subsistence, the creation of our earth, or any part of the universe, began.” To account for these interpretations by supposing a geological bias, would be sufficiently absurd; but in the case of the Christian fathers above cited, the supposition is more than absurd, it is impossible.

⁹⁰ *Commentary in loco.*

As to the second point: I repeat that, whether we regard their conflicting theories or their contradictory conclusions, their impotence or their virulence, nothing can be more ridiculous than the utter failures of these quasi-scientific opponents of the Bible. They tell us that we must greatly modify—if not altogether reject—the teaching of the Bible as to the fact of creation, and the unity, and antiquity of the human species. But if, on these points the Bible teaches popular error, who shall teach us scientific truth? Shall we find it in the school of Huxley and Darwin, who tell us that the differences between men and monkeys are so slight that it is impossible to regard them otherwise than as belonging to a common order, and descended from a common stock; or in the opposite school of Knox and Craufurd, who tell us (of mankind alone,) that the differences between the different families are so great that it is impossible to assign them a common origin? Right or wrong, the doctrine of the Bible is a doctrine of which each man has a witness in himself; it harmonizes with his actual condition—the remains of an inherent nobleness, now in ruins and degradation; and it is a sufficient account of the origination of that condition. But what is it that the doctrine of the transmutation of species harmonizes with? Not with actual fact, at any rate; for the first veritable instance of this transmutation has yet to be found. Equally destitute of foundation in fact is the doctrine of the Plurality of Races. What have we then? On the one hand we have the truth of the Bible, attested by universal history, by universal consciousness, and by every known fact, psychical and physiological. On the other, we have the conflicting guesses and the contradictory conclusions of two theories, mutually destructive, mutually impeaching each other, yet combining (!) to overthrow the Bible:—offering us discord for harmony, contrariety for unity, conjecture for certainty, theory founded on fiction for history attested by fact;—and, if we decline their offer, prospectively denouncing us as bigoted, irrational (!) and behind the age. Is not this sufficiently absurd?

Yet this is but the beginning. Failing in the attempt to develop the monad into a monkey, the monkey into a man, we are assured that one thing is plain, at all events:—if the

truth of the Bible has not been disproved as to the fact of creation, it most certainly has with respect to its date. We ask for the grounds of this assertion ; and we are favored with a good many more assertions ; but of indisputable proofs, not one. Professor Huxley offers us “a crushing argument ;” but it rests on a number of “ifs.” Mr. Darwin’s conclusions would be more formidable *if* his premises were less conjectural. But where is the force of saying—as in the very turning points of his argument he is continually saying—“I can hardly doubt,” “I can easily believe,” “We may suppose,” &c., &c.? No one doubts Mr. Darwin’s power of *supposing*. Sir Charles Lyell tells us of “a vast lapse of ages separating the era in which the fossil implements were formed and that of the invasion of Gaul by the Romans.” But what are his proofs? The time required for the growth of peat? Well: but that time (4000 years) is not quite enough to constitute the proof of “a vast lapse of ages!” Oh! but it “may have been four times as much.” “*May* have been :” is this the best *proof* that the prosecution is able to produce? Even so, their witness does not agree together. For Sir Charles himself had previously taught us that Hatfield Moss was “*clearly*” “a forest 1800 years ago ;” that “a considerable portion of the peat in European peat-bogs is *evidently* not more ancient than the age of Julius Cæsar ;” and, worst of all, in the lowest tier of that moss in the valley of the Somme, was found a boat loaded with bricks! Could anything be more unfortunate! except indeed, the damage done to Sir Charles’s calculations of “the stone period” by that cork plug in the canoe at Glasgow.

Are we pointed to the evidence derived from the discoveries in the valley of the Somme? Then we answer in the words of “The Athenæum”—“There is one defect in it which cannot be overlooked, and this is the absence of human bones in the alluvium. Amongst thousands of flint implements and knives scattered through the alluvial sand and gravel of the Somme, not a single human bone has yet been found. This demands consideration, especially when the objection is strengthened by the like dearth of the mortal remains of our species in all other parts of Europe where the tool-bearing drift of the post-pliocene period in valley deposits has been investigated.

“What can be the cause of this deficiency? Not the greater destructibility of human than of other animal bones, for Cuvier pointed out long ago that men’s bones were not more decayed than those of horses in ancient battle-fields; and in the Liége cavern, as above mentioned, human skulls, jaws, teeth, and other bones were found in the same condition as those of the cave-bear, tiger, and mammoth. It is strange, therefore, that while within the last twenty-five years thousands of mammalian bones from post-pliocene alluvium have been submitted to skilful osteologists, they have been unable to detect amongst these one fragment of a human skeleton, or even a tooth. A really satisfactory answer to this objection has not yet come before us.”

We repeat: “It *is* strange;” it does “demand consideration;” that to this objection, thus strengthened, no really satisfactory answer has yet been found.

Shall we be told that such bones have been found? Then we refer to Dr. Falconer⁹¹ for proof of the fraud practised upon the finder; to M. Elie de Beaumont for disproof of the alleged antiquity of the embedding deposit; and to Mr. Prestwich for the final conclusion—not that man is more ancient, but only—that the mammoth is more recent than had been supposed.

This paucity of human remains, and in many cases, their entire absence when they have been most eagerly looked for, is elaborately extenuated by Sir Charles Lyell. He seems however to be by no means satisfied with his own apology, for he adds “that ere long, now that curiosity has been so much excited on this subject, some human remains will be detected in the older alluvium of European valleys, I confidently expect.”⁹² Now, without saying that there seems but small

⁹¹ See his letter in the “*Times*” of 25th April, 1863.

⁹² Experience has taught us how to estimate these “great expectations.” “Dr. Mantell tells us that in 1831 some workmen employed in deepening the river Dove found, *ten feet below the bed of the river*, a mass of ferruginous conglomerate. Now, had there been discovered, embedded in that

mass, a bronze ring and a portion of a human hand, we should unquestionably have had a learned discussion in Sir Charles’s present volume, tending to show that here was a clear proof of man’s existence many thousand of years ago, for how else could his remains be found ten feet below the bed of a river? Happily, however, we have been spared all

ground for the confidence of this expectation, let us suppose it to be justified. Let us forget that half a century of geological progress, marked by eager researches and fruitful discoveries, is just as far as ever from having found the fossil man that is to overthrow the Bible. Instead of finding human remains in cave-deposits where, by our adversaries' admission, they prove nothing, let us imagine them to have been found where they have been so eagerly and so vainly sought for, among the flint-implements in the valley of the Somme. And, to give the argument all the weight of numbers, suppose them to be found not in tiny fragments of an individual skeleton, but in the serried ranks of the battle-field or the burial-ground. What would be the worth of the argument after all? If these much-coveted human bones were actually forthcoming—in the desired position, and in the required numbers—what then? Why, just this: that for all the purposes of argument they would be as ineffective and ridiculous as the fossil man of Guadaloupe. They could not prove the nature of the embedding deposit. They could not prove its age. They could not prove its right to be regarded as "diluvium." Nor could they furnish a particle of evidence in disproof of the declaration of one of the most eminent geologists living,⁹³ "that the Moulin Quignon beds⁹⁴ are not 'diluvium'; they are not even alluvia, but are simply composed of washed soil, deposited on the flanks of the valley by excessive falls of rain," and instead of indicating "a vast series of antecedent ages," they are not older than the "stone-period," the peat mosses, or the lake dwellings of Switzerland. So that the argument founded on these bones (though the bones are not found yet) is equally conclusive and final with the famous definition of a crab, agreed upon by the

these discussions; for in this conglomerate, thus lying far below a river's bed, there appeared some coins of Edward I."—*Archæological Journal*, vol. vii.; quoted in *Christian Observer*, vol. lxii., p. 359. See also *Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society*, vol. xvi., p. 54.

⁹³ M. Elie de Beaumont. (See above, p. 227 *note*. See too the recorded declarations of MM. Milne Edwards, and De Quatrefages: p. 220 *note*.)

⁹⁴ i.e. The site of the alleged discovery of the human jaw above referred to.

Academy of Sciences. “Crab : a red fish that walks backward.” “Admirable ! gentlemen (replies M. Dupin) ; but for the trifling circumstance that a crab is not a fish—that it is not red—and that it does not walk backward—your definition would be absolutely perfect !” Such precisely, is the predicament of this famous argument for “a vast series of antecedent ages.” “These bones are of the age alleged, for they are found in diluvium, and diluvium is of that age.” Most conclusive, gentlemen ; but for the trifling circumstance that they are *not* found in diluvium, and that diluvium is *not* of that age.

If anything can be more absurd than this, it is the pretended age of the diluvium. First, that age is attributed to it because of the utter absence of human remains. But when at last human remains are found in it, the presence of those remains is assumed as evidence of an age which was originally assigned on the ground of their absence ! If—as geologists have all along maintained—the absence of human remains did prove the high antiquity of the deposit ; then—on their own principles—the presence of those remains now proves its recency : and their argument is turned against themselves.

But they have another string to their bow, and triumphantly they twang it. Mr. Leonard Horner actually produced from the sediment of the Nile, a piece of pottery by which he proved, to his own satisfaction and that of his admirer Baron Bunsen, “that man had existed in Egypt more than 11,000 years before the Christian era ; and not merely existed, but had advanced in civilization so far as to know and practice the art of forming vessels of clay, and hardening them by fire.” He had no proof that the specimen produced was actually found at the spot indicated—that he was not the victim of a fraud for the profit of his workmen (like the trading on credulity practised at Abbeville)—that the specimen was not dropped into the old bed of the river, long after its diversion eastwards at the founding of Memphis—that it had not fallen into one of “the fissures into which the dry land is rent in summer, and which are so deep that many of them cannot be fathomed even by a palm branch”—that the site was not formerly one of the innumerable wells, from which water was raised by means of earthen pots—nor even that the Nile-deposit began to accumulate on that site be-

fore the fifth century of our era. But the greater the lack of evidence, the greater the room for guessing. To a man like Bunsen, requiring "twenty millenia" for the development of language, this piece of old pot was a perfect godsend. It required no such troublesome process as the alteration of the monumental inscriptions, the mutilation of Manetho, and the vilifying of Eusebius; it only required—puffing. So he did puff it—vigorously, in these words:—

"The operation performed, and the result obtained, are historical, not geological. The soil which has been penetrated is exclusively historical soil, coeval with mankind, and underlies a monument the date of which can be fixed with all desirable certainty. It is a soil accumulated at the same spot, by the same uninterrupted, regular, infallible agency of that river, which, like the whole country through which it flows, is a perfect chronometer. It is an agency evidently [!] undisturbed by any other agency, during these more than a hundred centuries, by flood or by deluge, by elevation or by depression. The fertilizing sediment is found in its place throughout."⁹⁵

But alas! for this "historical soil," this "perfect chronometer." Mr. Horner's own hand has shown—most unwittingly indeed, but most unmistakeably—that the soil was, after all, *unhistorical*, and the chronometer fatally imperfect. For "he tells us that 'fragments of *burnt brick* and of pottery have been found at even greater depths in localities near the banks of the river,' and that in the boring at Sigeul, 'fragments of *burnt brick* and pottery were found in the sediment brought up from between the fortieth and fiftieth foot from the surface.' Now, if a coin of Trajan or Diocletian had been discovered in these spots, even Mr. Horner would have been obliged to admit that he had made a fatal mistake in his conclusions: but a piece of *burnt brick* found beneath the soil tells the same tale that a Roman coin would tell under the same circumstances. Mr. Horner and M. Bunsen have, we believe, never been in Egypt; and we therefore take the liberty to inform them that there is not a single known structure of *burnt brick* from one end of Egypt to the other, earlier than the period of the Roman

⁹⁵ Egypt's Place in Universal History: vol. iii., Pref. p. xxvi.

dominion. These 'fragments of burnt brick,' therefore, have been deposited after the Christian era, and instead of establishing the existence of man in Egypt more than 13,000 years, supply a convincing proof of the worthlessness of Mr. Horner's theory."⁹⁶

O precious Bible! the defeat of thine enemies attests thy truth; "No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper; and every tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment thou shalt condemn!"

We must now dismiss the subject with a brief and rapid glance at the triumphs of the Bible on scientific ground. And here it is to be observed that these triumphs consist not only in a minute and substantial agreement between Bible statements and the mature conclusions of the inductive philosophy, but also in the fact that those statements convey, in the plainest language, a knowledge of truths which, until recently, were to Science herself, an enigmatic mystery.

Some two hundred years ago Harvey discovered the circulation of the blood—and was anathematized for his pains. But the Bible had implied the same truth as long ago as the Deluge:—"the blood is the life."⁹⁷ And all that Harvey and Hunter have done is to corroborate the fact, and show us the mode of operation.

What possible words could be more precise than those of Moses for distinguishing the rain from the dew?⁹⁸ Or what could more appropriately designate the great office of our atmosphere?—"to divide the waters from the waters." It lifts up, and holds suspended, a vast ocean of water. Were its power in this respect suddenly to cease, the earth would be deluged. In its marvellous work in raising and sustaining a thing eight hundred times as heavy as itself,⁹⁹ as well as in its

⁹⁶ Quarterly Review: vol. 105, p. 421.

⁹⁷ Ge. ix. 4; Le. xvii. 11—14; De. xii. 23.

⁹⁸ "My doctrine shall drop as the rain; my speech shall distil as the dew."

⁹⁹ "He bindeth up the waters in His thick clouds, and the cloud is not rent under them (Job. xxvi. 8). And again: "Dost thou know the balancings of the clouds?" (ch. xxxvii. 16.)

manner of letting it fall, we may well say, “The firmament sheweth God’s handywork ;” and praise Him for “the firmament of His power.”

It is Lord Bacon’s remark on the Book of Job—probably the earliest portion of the Bible, and the oldest book in the world—that it is “pregnant and swelling with natural philosophy.” It represents the Creator as considering all the circumstances and conditions of created things on earth, and then apportioning to the atmosphere the weight exactly suited to their well being.¹⁰⁰ But this truth was unknown to man until Torricelli (two hundred years ago) invented the barometer. Before that time, no one suspected that the atmospheric pressure on a full grown man was actually fifteen tons—that if it were less, the lungs could not use the air, and the blood vessels would burst—that water would not boil—that the waters of the ocean would rise up in vapour, and the entire animal and vegetable creation would be disorganized.

Let any one contrast the various fancies of ancient times, invented to account for the sustentation of the earth in space—Atlas, the Hindoo Elephant and Tortoise, the Surrounding Sea, the Yggdrasill, or mundane Ash-tree—with the declaration of Job, “He stretcheth out the north over the empty place, and hangeth the earth upon nothing.”¹⁰¹ How are we to account for this explicit statement of the actual fact, thousands of years before it became the subject of discovery by man, except by admitting that it was a revelation from God?

One of the most important, as well as most recent of modern discoveries, essential to the valuable prognostications of Admiral Fitzroy, was stated by Solomon long ages before it was possible that the fact could have been ascertained by natural means:—“The wind goeth toward the south, and turneth about unto the north ; it whirleth about continually, and the wind returneth again according to his circuits.”¹⁰² Modern science has tracked its path—from the north pole to the “calms of Cancer ;” then, as the “north-east trade wind,” to the “equatorial belt of

¹⁰⁰ Ch. xxviii. 24-25. “He looketh to the ends of the earth, and seeth under the whole heaven, to make the weight for the winds.”

¹⁰¹ Ch. xxvi. 7.

¹⁰² Ec. i. 6, 7.

calms ;" then, ascending to the "calms of Capricorn ;" where it once more descends, and as an under current, reaches the "calms of the South Pole," thence to re-ascend and traverse back its great circuit to the north. "It goeth toward the South, and turneth about unto the north ; . . . it returneth again according to its circuit."

Another physical fact announced by Solomon in anticipation of modern discovery, he thus expresses :—" All the rivers run into the sea, yet the sea is not full : unto the place from whence the rivers come, thither they return again." We may trace a drop of water as well as a particle of air. "Once it was part of a mighty billow in the mid-ocean under the tropics ; there it glittered in the bright sunshine till drawn up as vapour by that great furnace. Carried higher and higher, it at length overflowed the lower air towards the north ; there, descending with its portion of the atmosphere at the calm belt of Cancer, the west wind seized it, and rushed with it in his grasp along the course of the 'gulf-stream,' whose warmth still kept it a viewless prisoner in the air till it reached our shore. Here some high hill top wrests it at length from the wind, and it falls to the earth as a drop of rain. Then it sinks to some spring, whence it sparkles forth to feed some rivulet, which murmurs on to swell some river, which flows into the sea, and thus on to the wide ocean ; once more a drop in the great deep, until again taken up by the sun, to go on the same great circuit. Like the circulation of the blood in the body, unceasingly flowing from and returning to the heart, so all the waters of the earth are raised up by the sun, through the machinery of the atmosphere, and again let down by the same wonderful machinery in rain and dew to refresh the earth. But man's heart only throbs for its three score years and ten, whereas this mighty pulsation has worked for ages, and is still as fresh as when God spake it into operation."¹⁰³ But this marvellous water-circulation, although declared in Scripture nearly three thousand years ago, was not discovered by man, it was revealed by God : to man indeed,

¹⁰³ "The Law of Compensations" (in "The Christian Advocate :" vol. iii., p. 106).

without our present knowledge of physical geography, the discovery would have been impossible.

Convincing Job of his nothingness, the Almighty asks him, “Canst thou bind the sweet influences of Pleiades?” It is easy to see how, some fifty years ago, or less, philosophers “well up in the science of the day,” might object strongly to this passage as favouring Astrology, or as teaching that the stars influenced the weather. But one of the most wonderful of modern discoveries in Astronomy brings forth its true meaning, and establishes it as a fresh evidence of Inspiration. In the words of a writer whose ability is not less than his eloquence¹⁰⁴—“The Bible frequently makes allusion to the Laws of Nature, their operation and effects. But such allusions are often . . . concealed, until the lights and revelations of science are thrown upon them; then they burst out and strike us with exquisite force and beauty. As our knowledge of nature and her laws has increased, so has our understanding of many passages in the Bible been improved. ‘Canst thou bind the sweet influences of Pleiades?’ It has been recently all but proved, that the earth and sun, with their splendid retinue of comets, satellites, and planets, are all in motion around some point or centre of attraction inconceivably remote, and that that point is in the direction of the star Alcyone, one of the Pleiades.” So that “the influence” of this great central sun, situated in the “Pleiades,” draws “the whole of our solar and astral systems, including the ‘Milky-way,’ in vast stupendous sweep around it; one such revolution requiring, it is calculated, the inconceivable period of 18,200,000 years!” Thus have the researches of the astronomer brought out clearly and forcibly the meaning of this question put to Job, in the ages long ago; and demonstrated that HE asked it unto whom are known “all His works from the beginning of the world;” and that the Author of Nature and of the Bible is ONE.

When the Bible speaks of the form of our earth, it makes it A GLOBE.¹⁰⁵ When it speaks of its position in space, it HANGS

¹⁰⁴ Capt. Maury: “The Physical Geography of the Sea.”

¹⁰⁵ Is. xl. 22, “The *circle* of the

earth;” Pr. viii. 27, (margin,) “A *circle* upon the face of the depth.”

IT UPON NOTHING. When it speaks of its age, it points us to an epoch IN THE BEGINNING: before ages unnumbered, if not innumerable. Its heaven is the EXPANSE (Ἐργάτη, expansum), that is the void, the ether, or the immensity; but not the *firmamentum* of St. Jerome: nor the *στερέωμα* of the Alexandrine interpreters; nor the *eighth heaven*, firm, solid, crystalline, and incorruptible of Aristotle, and all the ancients. And although this remarkable term of the Hebrew occurs seventeen times in the Old Testament, and by the LXX is invariably rendered *στερέωμα* (firmament), yet this expression of the Greek interpreters is, in this sense, never once adopted by the New Testament writers.¹⁰⁶ When it speaks of light, it represents it as an element independent of the sun, and anterior, by three epochs, to that in which that great luminary was kindled; thus anticipating the most recent discoveries of the moderns. When it speaks of the creation of plants, it makes them vegetate, grow, and bear seed, before the appearance of the sun, and under conditions of light, heat, and humidity, different from those under which our vegetables live at the present day; and the former order of things thus revealed some thousands of years ago is conclusively attested by the discoveries of Fossil Botany in our own day. When it speaks of the creation of birds and fishes, it assigns them a common origin; and between those two classes of animals modern anatomists have discovered such deep-seated points of anatomical resemblance as extend even to the microscopic form of the globules of their blood. When it speaks of the stars, instead of supposing them to be a thousand, as in the catalogue of Hipparchus,¹⁰⁷ or as in that of Ptolemy, it calls them INNUMERABLE; it compares them, as Herschel would, to the sand on the sea-shore; it tells us that God has sown them like dust in the immensity of space, and that yet, He calls them all "by their names." And, to take that very instance in which a superficial scepticism has found most cause for cavilling, when

¹⁰⁶ In the only place where it is used (Col. i. 5), it denotes something very different from the heavens.

¹⁰⁷ To speak strictly 1022. Before the invention of the telescope, no greater number was visible.

it lays an arrest on the sun (i.e. on the rotation of the earth) in the days of Joshua, it takes care to make the moon stop also, in the same proportion with the sun, and from the same cause ; a precaution which, as Chaubard has shown, would never have been thought of by an astronomy that was ignorant of our diurnal movement ; since, after all, nothing more was required for the purposes of this miracle than the prolongation of the day.¹⁰⁸ But besides this,—

The sceptical cavil which here condemns the Bible as sanctioning a false astronomy is founded wholly on the translation in the Authorized Version ; the Hebrew original affords it not even the shadow of a ground. In that Version חַמָּה (chammah, “the sun”), and שֵׁמֶשׁ (shemesh, “the light of the sun”), are both translated “sun ;” as also לְבָנָה (lebanah, “the moon”), and יָרְאֵךְ (yareach, “the light of the moon”), are both translated “moon.” In the prediction of that time when “the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed,”¹⁰⁹ the words so rendered are לְבָנָה (lebanah) and חַמָּה (chammah) ; but Joshua’s words are “Light of the sun,” (שֵׁמֶשׁ shemesh) stand thou still upon Gibeon ; and thou, “Light of the moon” (יָרְאֵךְ yareach) in the valley of Ajalon.¹¹⁰ Other instances are Ge. xv. 12, 17 ; xix. 23 ; Jo. viii. 29 ; referring to sunrise or sunset, (i.e., to the appearance or disappearance of sunlight,) and Is. xxxviii. 8, “So the sunlight returned ten degrees :” In these, as in the greater number of instances, we have שֵׁמֶשׁ “shemesh.” But when the luminary itself is spoken of, as in Ps. xix. 6, (“nothing hid from the heat thereof,”) Ca. vi. 10, or Is. xxx. 26, then we read חַמָּה “chammah.” This last passage, from its conjunction of חַמָּה “sun” with רֹאשׁ “light,” is most conclusive. But where else shall we find a revelation exhibiting scientific accuracy such as this ? In the Shasters, the Vedas, the Puranas of the Hindus, where the sun sets behind the

¹⁰⁸ Elemens de Geologie par Chaubard : Paris. “The author there establishes by numerous arguments, the chronological coincidence of Joshua’s miracle with the deluges of Ogyges and Deucalion. He remarks that these

two cataclysms relate to the same epoch, lasted the same time, were accompanied with the same catastrophes, and produced currents in the same direction, flowing from west to east.” (Gaussens.)

¹⁰⁹ Is. xxiv. 23. ¹¹⁰ Jo. x. 12.

mountain Someyra, situated in the middle of the earth, and several thousand miles high ? Where the moon is 50,000 leagues higher than the sun, and shines with its own light. In the Koran, where mountains are created "to prevent the earth from moving, and to hold it fast as if with anchors and cables ?"

If the Bible had sanctioned the dreams of Leucippus as to the fixed stars, or those of Diodorus and all the Egyptian sages as to the formation of the heavens and the earth ; if, like Aristotle, and almost all the ancients, it had represented the heaven as a solid sphere to which the fixed stars are attached ; if, like Philoläus of Crotona, it had said that the stars were of crystal, or, like Empedocles, had lighted up the two hemispheres with two suns ; if like Philoläus it had given the sun a borrowed light merely, or, like Anaxagoras, had made it out to be a mass of iron larger than the Peloponnesus, and the earth to be a mountain whose roots stretched *infinitely* downwards ; if, with the finest minds of antiquity, Jews, Greeks and Latins, Tacitus, De Thou, and the sceptic Montaigne,¹¹¹ it had taught that "the stars have domination and power, not only over our lives and the conditions of our fortune, but even over our inclinations, our discourses, our wills ;" if it had spoken of the antipodes like Lucretius, or Laetantius, like Plutarch or Pliny, like St. Augustine or Pope Zachary ; if it had endorsed the blunders in the cosmogony of Buffon, or the sneers of Voltaire on the fossil animals of a primitive world ;¹¹²—if any one of these things had happened, there might then have been some ground for the pretence that 'Scripture and Science are at variance.' But how utterly contrary is the fact !

Turn now, from these guesses of human wisdom to the authentic utterances of Divine Revelation, and what do you find ? You find a Book "written by one educated in the first Egyptian schools, and consequently versant in their system of cosmogony ; written for a people still sunk in the ignorance attendant on serfdom, and thus prepared to receive blindly any feasible speculations on subjects beyond their reach ; written in a

¹¹¹ Essays : book ii. ch. 12.

from "The World's Birth-day," in

¹¹² See Gaußen's Theopneustia : ch. iv. sec. 6. See also Extract

Appendix, Note C.

desert, where there were no schools to criticise, no enlightenment to detect errors, no rivals to expose them ; written, in fine, under every imaginable temptation for the author to indulge his fancy, or display his learning. Yet while the advancing stream of knowledge has swept into the sea of fiction all other early records of creation, this one stands proudly amid the tides which fret against its borders, but bear not an atom away. The very torrents that have overwhelmed its counterfeits, flow around it, an unfordable defence ; while every tributary poured in from some new-sprung source of knowledge only swells the stream that would bear down an assailant. He who believes that any man, by his unaided foresight, could have chronicled creation's birth, in times when its system was grossly misconceived, without assuming principles, and hazarding facts, which would be falsified by the discoveries of subsequent ages, not only displays a capacious credence, but contravenes the facts which the sacred literature of ancient nations develops.”¹¹³

But Moses *has* thus chronicled creation's birth.

In this single fact we have the conclusive proof of a Divine Inspiration ;—a Power inscrutable, infallible, sometimes suggesting, always controlling, extending to every subject, choosing every word ;—a Power whose instruments are human, but whose Nature and operations are Divine. Is not this the finger of God ?

Admit this, and you assign a cause adequate to the effect. Deny it, and the fact remains inexplicable. But in either case the fact itself is incontrovertible. It is so as a perpetual demonstration that “THE SCRIPTURE CANNOT BE BROKEN ;” and that those whose final standard of appeal is still “The Law and the Testimony,” may KNOW the abiding and infallible CERTAINTY of the things wherein they have been instructed.

¹¹³ Mission to the Mysore: ch. iii.

PART III.
SOPHISMS.

CHAPTER X.

“The last step of reason is to recognise that there is an infinity of things which surpass reason.”—PASCAL.

“He who thinks rationally must inevitably cease to think rationalistically.”
—PROF. AUBERLEN.

WHAT I propose in this chapter is, briefly to refute those assertions of our opponents which have been most prominently put forward and most frequently reiterated, as being most important, and which, with a dogmatism surpassed only by their fallaciousness, have a special claim to the character of Sophisms. Thus we are often told

I. That “the dogma of an infallible Bible is on a par with an infallible Pope, and will soon be as utterly exploded.”

In this short sentence the fallacies are manifold. What is meant by “dogma ?” Does it mean an established principle, or an unwarrantable opinion, or something between these two ? Whatever it means, it is incapable of being applied to subjects as essentially diverse as those of which it is here used in common. Again: those subjects are affirmed to be “on a par.” We utterly deny the affirmation, and demand proof. Wherein does this parity consist ? where shall we find the equality here asserted ? Is it in the kind of proof adduced for the two propositions ? Is it in the degree ? Is it in both together ? It is simply nowhere. The doctrine of an infallible Bible is established on the explicit declarations of the Bible itself: *e.g.*, “All Scripture is given by Inspiration of God.” Will it be pretended by those who assert the parity of these two propositions that declarations like these—as direct, as explicit, as conclusive,—are adducible in support of the notion of an infallible Pope. There is no pretence of the sort. They are

therefore dissimilar in kind. But the sophism requires not only that such declarations should be found but that they should be found in like numbers. There is no pretence to this either : and the evidence for the two propositions is not more unlike in kind than in degree. Where then is their parity? And what opinion must we form of these sophistical objectors who have so little respect for their own character as to hazard vaticinations founded on fallacies like these? If in very deed, the two things had been of the same kind, the fate of the one might possibly have been predicated from that of the other. But what becomes of such prognostications when it is seen that they possess not one single element in common ?

II. That “Scripture and Science are irreconcileably at variance, but since Science is invariably true, the truth of Science demonstrates the falsity of Scripture.”

“Science is invariably true :” Is it? Where? when? which science? Our forefathers, two centuries ago, prescribed that the patient, suffering from an inveterate disease, should seek his cure by washing his hands in the moonbeams falling on the sides of an empty bowl. At this day, if a Hindu astronomer has got the colic, the orthodox prescription is to cut an onion in two and squeeze the juice into the sufferer’s eye. The little amenities of Cuchillo and Sangrado in a former age were not more remarkable than those of allopathy and homœopathy in our own. Is this the science that is invariably true? Or perhaps it is the science of those who taught that Nature abhorred a vacuum, who assigned to tortoises, serpents, and elephants, the task of holding up the earth, and to the mountains the work of keeping it steady? Or is it the science of those who affirm that the common origin of mankind is an absolute impossibility, or of those who assign a common origin to men and mice, and beeves, and beetles? None of these? What? It is only of *true* science that you make this affirmation? A safe course certainly : (—“True Science is invariably true !”) and worthy of modern gnosticism. But then, by establishing the truth of science you are only establishing the truth of Scripture, for with True Science, Scripture is *not* at variance. Witness Owen, and Faraday, and Herschel, and

Maskelyne, and Buckland, and Miller, and Murchison, and Phillips, and Hitchcock, and Whewell, and Gosse, and a host of others not less illustrious, who count it at once their highest privilege and their noblest distinction to follow the example of Bacon, and Newton, and Boyle, and Pascal, and Cuvier, and Locke, in bringing the treasures of Science as rightful tribute to the supremacy of Scripture. In the preceding pages it has been shewn that to use popular language on scientific subjects, so far from furnishing an objection to Scripture, is its highest commendation. For what is the first condition of a revelation, if it be not intelligibility? Besides, strictly scientific formulas are discarded for popular phraseology by scientific men themselves. If the Bible gives expressions of relative rather than of absolute truth, so do the strictest forms of scientific speech; this is the language of the learned and unlearned alike. So much for the form. As to the substance, we have seen, not contradiction, but concord; no variance in either, but verity in both. Those who propound this sophism have hitherto done nothing but reiterate an exploded assertion: their first fact in proof of its validity has yet to be found.

III. But "although the old belief be unsubverted by the discoveries of modern science, it cannot possibly survive the exposures of modern Criticism."

What is this Criticism? what has it achieved? Its very best specimens, and its very highest laudation, are found in the pages of Dr. Colenso. Its utter worthlessness, as shewn in his first volume, we have already seen.¹ His second volume turns entirely on "the Elohistic and Jehovahistic question"—a chaos of opposing hypotheses.² And then, in his third, he lauds this aggregation of conjecture and mistake, under the name of "criticism," as if it were an exact science, as certain in its results as arithmetic itself. Thus he tells us first, of its "undoubted and undeniable results;"³ then by the power of "development" these results are raised to the rank of "established facts;"⁴ further on, his utterly unfounded assertion as to the authorship of Deuteronomy is assumed to be "*a fact*

¹ Ante, pp. 57—74. ² Vide Ante pp. 94—101. ³ P. xvi. ⁴ P. xli.

that has been proved;"⁵ "we now *know* that the writer lived in a later day than the other writers of the Pentateuch;"⁶ and "we must accept it as a matter of fact, that the Book of Deuteronomy was not written by Moses."⁷ Unfortunately for the poor bishop, however, his very allies are against him. His much-lauded facts are scouted by his own friends as fallacies unworthy of notice. His pet hypothesis (Jeremiah's authorship of Deuteronomy) was considered long ago by De Wette and Ewald, and rejected by both of them; and Dr. Davidson treats it as too improbable to need any refutation. As to the "document hypothesis" the most celebrated writers convict each other of false criticism. Hüpfeldt condemns Knobel; Ewald condemns Hüpfeldt and Knobel; Knobel condemns Ewald and Hüpfeldt. They may all be wrong together; we have the testimony of each against some other; so that in any case not more than one of them can possibly be right. But besides the mutual contradiction and confusion of the leaders in this labyrinth, there is the confusion worse confounded of the followers and imitators. Take into account all the varieties and contrasts of opinions indicated by the mere names Astruc, Eichhorn, Ilgen, Gramberg, De Wette, and Von Bohlen; some making two, others three, others four, and Ewald seven documents by different authors the materials of Genesis; one supposing that the documents are pre-Mosaic, another that they were written in the times of Joshua or the Judges, another in the time of David, another some centuries later; and how uncertain must the principles of their criticism appear, how valueless their conclusions! Shall we not rather say that such criticism is utterly *unprincipled*, and that in such conclusions nothing is concluded? "With such facts can any sane person talk of the results of modern criticism as regards the Book of Genesis? or be willing to give up the belief of centuries for such criticism as this?"⁸

IV. "Objections urged by such men as Dr. Colenso must have something in them."

Why, so they have. They have that which the enemies of

⁵ P. 406.

⁶ P. 431.

⁷ P. 620.

⁸ *Aids to Faith* : p. 193.

the Bible are ashamed to have to admit. They have that which stamps them as equally ignorant and prejudiced, presumptuous and profane. Their virulence is unsurpassed—except by their impotence. But this is not what our sophist means. What he seeks to insinuate is this:—The Bishop of Natal is a first-rate arithmetician; the Regius Professor of Greek at Oxford is (of course) a good Grecian; the Vice-Principal of Lampeter cannot be ignorant of Hebrew; they are clever men, too clever to adopt new opinions on insufficient grounds. “*Too clever*,” are they? Why there is not one of them with cleverness enough to save him from an amount of blundering quite sufficient to destroy all claims to authority as a critic.⁹ But even if we were to admit that the authority and accuracy of each, in his own province, was unimpeachable; what then? Why, then the argument will hardly bear exposure in plain words, for it amounts to this:—Dr. Colenso is a good mathematician, *ergo* he is a sound divine. He understands one thing, *therefore* you may safely conclude that he understands another thing: and this too although between the two there is so little of natural or necessary connection that Professor Whewell and many others assure us that the exclusive pursuit of the first is a positive disqualification for forming a right judgment as to the second! Nor can it fail to be observed that these objections which “must have something in them” (since their author is a mathematician) do certainly possess this disqualifying element in a very high degree. They depend for the most part (the newest of them) on questions in “Long Division” and an absurd literality not to be paralleled,

⁹ Dr. Rowland Williams's errors are already out of date. Bishop Colenso's, more numerous if not more gross, are fast becoming so; and Prof. Jowett, though honorably distinguished from some of his coadjutors by an honest fairness and a noble reverence of which they give no sign, is yet on the ground of competence but little less incapable of sound

criticism than they are. Even in that particular in which his competence is commonly assumed without question, his grossly defective and erroneous representation of the Pauline Greek has been repeatedly remarked; but especially by Professor Lightfoot in his Notice of the “Commentary on Galatians.”

except perhaps by Peter Simple, who, when the coachman touched his hat and said "Please remember the coachman," replied "*Remember you!*!" "Certainly I will try, if it will give you any pleasure!" "Something in them" indeed! yes; something that few besides a Peter Simple would ever have put there, when they represent a crowd of people—not as we see crowds congregated every day, but arranged with mathematical precision—standing in close column, nine men in a rank, and the ranks eighteen inches apart!¹⁰ But waving this peculiar and special disqualification, and putting the argument on the broad ground most favourable to the objector, was anything like it ever heard before?—Your friend is a prime judge of horse-flesh; *ergo* he is the very man to consult on the choice of a piano! Beethoven was a master in music; *therefore* you should put implicit faith in whatever he may have said about short-horns and mangold-wurzel!

V. "If these objections were urged by a few superficial thinkers it would be another matter; it is the combined momentum of so many minds that constitute their force."

Rather good, certainly. For it is much the same as saying that twenty or thirty men considered individually may be asthmatical or crippled, but combined, they constitute one man, sound in wind and limb! A proposition eminently mathematical, and eminently illustrative of the new process of inverted reasoning. Given, the healthy result desired, to find the number of unhealthy factors required for its production. What number of ciphers will constitute unity?

Thus, the result is impossible even if the process of combination were possible. But this process is itself impossible. The "combined momentum" of the sophism, is nowhere to be found. It does not exist. "*Quot homines, tot sententiae*" receives its highest illustration in the vagaries of the boasted unity of these "many minds." Speaking generally, they may be classed together as opponents of the Bible. But as to the extent to which their opposition should be carried—as to the

¹⁰ The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined: Part I. p. 33.

reasons by which it may be justified—or the methods by which it may be maintained—no two of them are in accord. Each separate school of opinion loudly demonstrates the futility and folly of the opinions of all the rest ; and within each school the conflict between leaders and followers is not less loud, though perhaps less noticeable, than that which rages outside. If the Vice-Principal of St. David's exercises a “verifying,” the Bishop of Natal wields a falsifying, faculty. Of that remarkable prophecy concerning “Joseph,” found in the “blessing where-with Moses the man of God blessed the children of Israel before his death,” Dr. Colenso tells us that “Moses could not have written it” because it does not contain a Messianic prophecy ; but when Philip the Evangelist, speaking by a special inspiration, shows the Messianic prophecy of the fifty-third of Isaiah, Dr. Williams comes forward to shew us (by means of his “verifying faculty”) that Philip was mistaken, and that a Messianic prophecy was impossible. Some are for retaining the whole Bible, at the same time enervating it by that Socinian process of interpretation of which Coleridge justly said that “if they were to offer to construe the will of a neighbour as they did that of their Maker, they would be scouted out of society.” To avoid this disgraceful necessity, others will retain only those portions which pertain to faith and morals. But to avoid the difficulty of selecting and separating such portions, others again choose to abide by particular books. They are not yet agreed, however, as to which those books shall be. Some are for “the prophetic teaching,” which they regard as “the essence of the Revelation, sifted from its accidental accompaniments.”¹¹ Others affirm that there is no prophetic teaching. Some accept the New Testament but reject the Old. Others reject the Epistles and retain the Gospels alone. One considers the three synoptical Gospels as alone authoritative ; another deems that of John superior to all the rest. One receives every book in the Canon but Daniel ; another makes no exception except to the Revelation. And these varieties of opinion—these results of a “remorseless criticism”—as to the Books themselves, are but a mere bagatelle to the disputes as to the contents of the

¹¹ Stanley's Lectures on the Jewish Church ; p. 443.

Books. Talk about “the combined momentum of so many minds!” why, these very minds, from the profoundest to the shallowest, are utterly and hopelessly divided. To hear the common talk, one would think that these “powerful minds” had *convinced* one another: but instead of that they have merely *confounded* one another.

VI. “If even the divine authority of the whole Bible could be established, it would still be unworthy the enlightenment of our age to submit to the bondage of the letter.”

To what then must we submit? What other “bondage” can you offer us, lighter or worthier than this? If to submit our opinions to the authority of established truth be unworthy of us, what alternative have you to offer that shall be not unworthy? Shall we vainly listen for those internal oracles, those moral intuitions which Mr. Newman tells us are the only safe, nay the only possible guides? But they are blind guides! they are themselves darkly groping and eagerly disputing. If there be one point more than another on which these guides ought to afford us some guidance, it is surely that of a future existence. But they are still in doubt about it. Some of the disciples of this school affirm that their intuitions do affirm this doctrine; others tell us that their intuitions are silent on the subject. They are agreed, however, that to quit this dark uncertainty for the positive assurance, “He that followeth Me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life,” would be unworthy of them, for they scorn to be in bondage to the letter!

Or shall we be told that we must submit to the dictates of conscience? Why, many of those who are most eager to throw off the yoke of the Bible are among the foremost to admit that conscience, as a moral rule, “is most flexible, and to an indeterminate degree the creature of association, custom, and education.” It is the doctrine of the Jesuits that at the dictate of conscience the most shameless crimes become bounden duties. Is that the doctrine of those who urge us to throw off the bondage of the letter? It is certainly not Dr. Temple’s doctrine, and yet he makes the Bible subordinate and Conscience supreme: Conscience, “whom it may be a duty to enlighten, but whom it can never be a duty to disobey.” But conscience in-

volves the ideas of transgression, and judgment; and these again involve the idea of law. Where there is no law there is no transgression, and no conscience of sins.

Mr. Jowett's statement of this sophism is still more seductive and not less fallacious. He says, "It is not the *book* of Scripture which we should seek to give them, to be reverenced like the Vedas or the Koran, but the *truth* of the book;" which "will not have a less inestimable value because the spirit has *taken the place* of the letter;" "a life of Christ in the soul, *instead of a theory of Christ* which is in a book or written down." But what says Christ himself? "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." "If this statement has meaning, it must mean, that the spirit and life of Christianity *are not*, where the words, the doctrines of Christianity are not. Reception of the *words* is necessary to an experience of the *life*.

"The religion of the *letter*, taken alone, is not only barren, but corrupting. It is not only devoid of the fruits proper to true religion,—it is productive of fruits proper only to false religion. But the religion of the *spirit* as existing among our philosophical spiritualists, is itself an error in an opposite direction. The religion of the letter alone, if carried fairly out, ends in a fanatical superstition. The religion of the spirit alone, if carried fairly out, ends in the most scientific form of mere deism. By the one, the Bible is denuded of its proper *result*; for souls are not regenerated. By the other, the Bible is denuded of its proper *authority*; for the authority of the interpreter becomes greater than that of the text. In either case, the loss is the loss of Christianity. In either case there may be a kind of religiousness; but it will not be the religion of Christ. If the *words*—the doctrines of Christ, are to be without historical certainty and authority, then nothing higher is left to mankind than such systems of religion as may be generated by their own experiences, in accordance with their own sense of need. **IF WE HAVE NOT A CHRISTIANITY SUSTAINED BY AUTHENTIC DOCUMENTS, WE HAVE NONE.** All pretence to anything certainly Christian, on the part of men who repudiate the historical proofs of Christianity, must be simply absurd. When such men tell us, that they have tried the historical argument, and found

it fail them, and still claim to be regarded as in possession of all that was most valuable in primitive Christianity, we are constrained to ask them, *How do you know that?* Certainly the man who can persuade himself that he has a right to claim a place among Christians, while giving up the historical evidence of Christianity, must be in a state of mind to persuade himself of anything.”¹²

VII. “Take care of Christianity, and let the Creeds take care of themselves.”

A sophism equally high sounding and senseless. For apart from Christianity the Creeds are nothing. They are the embodiment of the facts of Christianity; of facts so fundamental to faith that if once those facts could be lost, the loss would be that of Christianity itself. The flippant superficiality which is content to say with Pope

“For modes of faith let graceless zealots fight,
His can’t be wrong whose life is in the right,”

is not fond of reasoning, or we might ask where this paradox is to be found. This man “whose life is in the right,” how and whence did he obtain his knowledge of what is “right”? How is it possible to conceive of a knowledge of right and wrong apart from belief of some kind or other? Or where can we find a practical exhibition of this right knowledge, except as the result of an antecedent faith? It is no wonder that sophisms of this sort should obtain currency even with our most influential writers, when even Mr. Jowett can be superficial enough to say “that the power of the Gospel resides not in the particulars of theology, but in the Christian life.” Is the doctrine of the resurrection one of the “particulars of theology?” Unquestionably: and yet without it the Gospel has no power, and “faith is vain.” Is it the doctrine of salvation by faith that is thus stigmatized? or the doctrine of Christ’s atoning sacrifice? Yet in the opinion of the great apostle, these particulars of theology were nothing less than the very concentration and embodiment of “the power of the Gospel.” “We preach Christ crucified,” said he, “the power of God unto salvation to every one that be-

¹² Dr. R. Vaughan, on “The Letter and the Spirit.”

lieveth." To talk of "the power of the Gospel" without faith, is like talking of Christianity without Christ. And what are the Creeds but an enumeration of the subjects of faith? If after all, they are but of secondary importance, what means that solemn iteration on the highest of all authority, "He that believeth shall be saved;" "Believest thou this?" "All things are possible to him that believeth;" "Do ye now believe?"

VIII. "We ask for evidence, and you offer us faith. If your evidence is sufficient, why talk of faith? and if it be insufficient, on what ground do you require us to believe?"

The charge is not true. You take good care not to ask for evidence. You know very well that the introduction and propagation of Christianity have changed the face of the world, have induced myriads of men to forsake the religion of their forefathers, voluntarily to incur the loss of friends and fortune and all that makes life dear, to encounter labours, perils, dangers, and sufferings, and finally to lay down their lives in attestation of the truths they had received,—and that to all this they were impelled by the irresistible force of the evidence alone. You know all this; you know that it is perfectly undeniable and perfectly irrefragable; and yet you affect to believe that Christianity rests on insufficient evidence!

"But if the evidence is sufficient, why talk of faith?" Because the evidence on which Christianity rests and the faith which Christianity requires are two very distinct things, serving different purposes and securing different ends. The evidence arrests our attention, convinces our understanding, challenges our obedience, and demonstrates the true origin and character of the revelation which (by the force of the evidence alone) we are constrained to receive as Divine. But being Divine, it must contain much that is "too high" for us; not only much sublimity, but also much complexity and mystery. It is characteristic of "the words of the wise" that they should be "dark sayings;" and He who spake as never man spake was complained of for his "hard sayings." What else could we expect when the Teacher is "The Ancient of Days," and the taught are but "of yesterday;" when in One "are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge," and in the other all

the ignorance of a childhood that “knows nothing?” It is these mysteries that transcend our poor capacity which, if received at all, must be received by faith. To receive them without the attestation of the evidence on which they rest would be to exhibit not faith, but folly, and weak credulity. To receive them with that attestation, and in consequence of it, is the logical result of the highest reason. If, for a moment, Faith is staggered by the difficulties that ask “How can these things be?” she is strengthened as she reflects that the evidence has made it absolutely certain that these things are. And Reason is a very competent judge of the fact, although utterly in the dark as to the mode. There is no room for mistake, and no room for doubt, when we look at the signature and seals on the document of Truth, though there is room for both when we attempt to sit in judgment on pages that we cannot understand. We may go round about the citadel of Revelation, “mark well her bulwarks,” count her towers, assure ourselves by personal examination that her ramparts are impregnable, and her foundations immovable; but we cannot scale her cloud-capp’d heights, nor look on her golden pinnacles lost in the brightness of a glory that blinds our feeble gaze. For even while He reveals, God is “a God that hideth” Himself, and thus “hides pride from man.” We must be content to “know in part,” and to reason from the known to the unknown. We do know the certainty of the facts which prove that “the doctrine” is of God, although we have yet much to learn about the doctrine itself. But can anything be more absurd than to suffer what we know thoroughly, to be affected by what we do not know at all? to put actual knowledge at the mercy of possible conjecture? to say that we cannot be quite sure of what we do know, because there still remains something that we don’t know? The Author of Christianity claims our implicit faith. On what ground? The ground of evidence alone. “If I do not the works of My Father, believe me not:” “The works that I do, they bear witness of Me.” The impenetrable mystery, the profound spirituality of the truths enunciated in the discourses of St. John’s Gospel, abundantly account for the reiterated demand for faith on the part of the Great Teacher; and the force and justness of that demand are still seen in the con-

fession of one who felt that no subsequent difficulty could ever alter the antecedent fact—"THOU ART a Teacher come from God: for *no man* can do these miracles that Thou doest."

IX. "But a miracle is impossible."

How do you know that? In declaring a miracle to be impossible, you are making a declaration not only opposed to unquestionable facts, but one too which, on your own principles it is impossible to prove.

What is a miracle? Those who thus glibly assert that a miracle is impossible are not unfrequently sorely puzzled to tell what a miracle is. Suppose however, we accept that definition most commonly given, from Hume to Baden Powell, and regard a miracle as "a violation or suspension of a law of Nature:"—what then? does not law imply a Lawgiver? must not the operation of the statute be subordinate to the control of the enacting Power? Again: what is meant by "a law of Nature?" Is it not simply this, that "similar phenomena uniformly reappear in an observed series of antecedents and consequents, which series is invariable?" Yet what a fallacy is here! Who can tell that this series is invariable? Hume talked of the uniformity of experience: but neither he nor his admirers can know anything (experimentally) of an experience not their own. On their principle the king of Siam was right in rejecting, as an incredible fiction, that which all the while was a most indubitable truth. For to say that water sometimes becomes solid, that it is capable of sustaining the weight of a train of elephants, that it can be cut into pieces and put into one's pocket;—all this was to contradict the uniform experience on which (like Mr. Hume,) the king relied, when he affirmed the alleged phenomenon to be impossible, and therefore untrue. Nor was it his individual experience alone which was thus contradicted; but also that of all his court, and of every other person with whom he had previously come into contact. On Mr. Hume's principle, therefore, that the alleged phenomenon was contrary to uniform experience, he was fully justified in rejecting it. And yet he was wrong! The error of the principle therefore, is demonstrated by the error of the result. And this error is twofold. The first fallacy lies in the quiet assumption

and substitution of an experience limited and partial for one that is universal. Without this fallacy the sophism is too transparent to escape immediate detection. For if the impugners of miracles do not mean to claim for themselves a universal uniformity of experience, they mean nothing. For to abandon this claim is to admit that although their experience has not included the witnessing of miraculous phenomena, yet this may be included in the experience of others. The partial and therefore misleading experience of the court of Siam as to the invariable fluidity of water weighs not one particle against the contrary experience of Northern Europe ; and the similarly defective experience of Mr. Hume and his successors is equally unavailing to counterbalance the wider experience of prophets and apostles.

But if the impugners of miracles do mean to claim the uniformity of universal experience : how then ? Why, then we have the second fallacy. They pretend to a universal experience, and yet there is not a man among them that possesses a tittle of experience beyond the range of his own personal observation. Shall we be told of their *united* experience ? As well tell us of their united individuality. For of what does this united experience consist ? Ask the first man you meet who boasts that the united experience of mankind is opposed to the possibility of miracles, and see if he be not obliged to confess that this boasted experience consists after all, in an infinitesimal amount of actual experience (i.e. his own,) together with his belief in the testimony of other persons as to their experience. So that those who profess to impugn the Christian miracles on the ground of experience, are really doing it on the ground of testimony ! The facts on which they rely for their induction as to the uniformity of experience are—not only partial, incomplete, and therefore misleading—but they are not *known* to be facts after all—they lack the guarantee of experience—they have been received and admitted as facts *on the ground of testimony* !

When therefore, we are told that a miracle is impossible because it is contrary to experience, we ask to whose experience it is contrary ? To that of the objector ? Very likely. No one pretends that miracles are as common as blackberries. If

they were not rare, they would not be miraculous. Granted therefore, that the objectors never witnessed a miracle: does it follow that no one else ever did? That water should freeze was, beyond all question to the Asiatic mind, "contrary to experience;" and yet to the Dutch ambassador no experience was more sure. So that a fact may be "contrary to experience," and yet not contrary to truth! Of what use is an experience like this?

Thus then, when the impugners of miracles essay their vaunted experience, the weapon breaks in their hands. But besides this, it is to be observed that they are not constant (let us not say insincere) in their reliance on experience after all. In one of his letters to D'Alembert, Voltaire says "I persist in thinking that a hundred thousand men who had seen a dead man restored to life might very well be a hundred thousand men who had bad eyes." And what he says of their bad eyes, there is no doubt he would say of his own, if he had been one of the hundred thousand. And with him, in common consistency, Hume, and Strauss, and all their followers would be bound to agree. And why should they not? Suppose that in proof of a miracle they had the evidence of their senses. Have not the senses often beguiled and deceived men? Besides, that can never be actual which is always impossible; but a miracle is impossible: therefore that miracle which they had just witnessed must be resolved into a mere semblance, and illusion. For to arrive at any other conclusion would be to abandon their fundamental principle that a miracle is impossible. But holding to their sublime principle they must deny the evidence of their senses, and trust to testimony: they must renounce their own experience, and rely instead upon that general experience of others which comes to them in the shape of testimony, and can come in no other way.

So that those who hold this principle are in this position:—If they err, and God should work a miracle for the very purpose of convincing them of their error, it would be impossible for Him to attain His purpose. Startling, but true. For they have beforehand made up their minds that a miracle is absolutely impossible. It can appeal to nothing stronger than the senses; and they are far too wise to run the risk of being

imposed upon by anything half so illusory as impressions on the senses! Accordingly, the latest oracle of this school has boldly declared that "In nature and from nature, by science and by reason, we neither have, nor can possibly have, any evidence of a Deity working miracles!"¹³

Nor is this an isolated or exaggerated statement. For the same authority tells us of "the *inconceivableness* of imagined interruptions of natural order, or supposed suspensions of the laws of matter."¹⁴ "Intellect and philosophy," he adds, "are compelled to disown the recognition of anything in the world of matter at variance with the first principle of the laws of matter—the universal order and indissoluble unity of physical causes."¹⁵ With him it is a fundamental principle "to recognize the *impossibility* even of any two material atoms subsisting together without a determinate relation—of any action of the one on the other, whether of equilibrium or of motion, without reference to a physical cause—of any modification whatsoever in the existing conditions of material agents, unless through the invariable operation of a series of eternally-impressed consequences, following in some necessary chain of orderly connection, however imperfectly known to us."¹⁶ Thus peremptorily do these modern gnostics shut God out of his own world. No wonder that they add, "If miracles were in the estimation of a former age among the chief supports of Christianity, they are at present among the main difficulties, and hinderances to its acceptance."¹⁷

Such are some of the more prominent fallacies involved in the assertion that "a miracle is impossible," and such the absurd conclusion to which they lead. It needs but to be further observed, that their assertion is refuted not more thoroughly by its own fallacies, than by its flagrant contradiction of unquestionable facts.

The world contains no greater fact than the existence of Christianity. Trace that existence to its origin: and then—get rid of miracles if you can. As mere matter of history nothing

¹³ Baden Powell, in "Essays and Reviews," (Ed. 1860) p. 142.

¹⁴ Ibid. p. 110.

¹⁵ Ibid. p. 127.

¹⁶ Ibid. p. 133.

¹⁷ Ibid. p. 140.

is more certain than this :—that Christianity, as a new religion, was founded on miracles alone. Its Divine Founder declared that it was in the rejection of the evidence furnished by His miracles that the guilt of that generation consisted :—“ If I had not done among them the works that none others did, they had not had sin.” If the doom of Chorazin and Bethsaida were more terrible than that of Tyre and Sidon, it was because of “the mighty works” that had been wrought therein. If the hierarchs of that day were eager to imbrue their hands in the blood of the new Teacher, it was because they found it impossible to evade the force of the popular questions suggested by the number and the splendour of His miracles :—“ Whence hath this man. . . these mighty works?” “ When Christ cometh will He do more miracles than these ?”

But waving the history—treating the matter as if there were no well-authenticated record that when “the word” was preached it was “confirmed with signs following,” and that miracles were the signs of an apostle—we fix our attention simply upon the fact. Christianity exists: it therefore *was* established by some means. It is for those who discard miracles to tell us by what means. By the wealth, learning, influence, connexions, of its first apostles? Why, silver and gold they had none; they were a set of ignorant provincials, Galileans whose speech bewrayed them; shaken off from the skirts of Society, as the filth and offscouring of all things. By concessions to popular prejudice, and compliance with public opinion? No: for they combated that prejudice, and completely changed that opinion. By sailing with the tide? They stemmed it. By patronage? They knew not what it meant. They were persecuted to the death by the blind and bitter fury of the rulers both in Church and State; but in spite of high priests and Emperors their disciples were found in myriads in every province of the empire, in the camp, the senate, the forum; the gory knife of the executioner dropped from the palsied hand of power; and their bitterest foe, as he gave up the unequal contest, cried “O Galilean, thou hast conquered!” Destitute of all the appliances, and despising all the artifices employed to prop up the tottering decrepitude of other systems—without means, without patronage, without money to obtain

either—Christianity overthrew those systems with all their abettors, and established herself in their room. The effects of that beneficent Revolution have gone on increasing and intensifying to this day. But, for those effects (as for all others) there must be an adequate cause. And the only such cause assignable is to be found in the fact of the Christian miracles. And from that fact there is no escape. For to deny those miracles, is to admit (in the fact of Christianity) the existence of a certain effect which transcends every assignable cause. And the existence of such an effect is in itself a miracle. If there be any force in reason, or any truth in history, then Christianity is founded on miracles:—and we have a miracle in that direction. If there be no force in reason, and no truth in history, then the existence of Christianity without miracles is itself the most stupendous of all miracles:—and we have the miracle in that direction. The impugner of miracles may accept either of these alternatives, but he cannot reject both. If he could, that would be the greatest miracle of all!

Look at the cardinal miracle of Christianity,—the resurrection of our Lord. Our sophist denies the fact; that is easy. But then, he cannot deny the consequences; that is by no means easy. He has still to account for the subsequent boldness of those disciples who, at first, had been noted only for their cowardly desertion of their Master and Friend: for Peter's weak denial under circumstances that should have made him strong, contrasted with his undaunted affirmation when (in peril of his life) he stood alone, with everything to fear. He has to account for the impunity of the Roman Guard; and the non-production of the dead body: for the persistency with which the witnesses of the resurrection constantly affirmed it; for the absolute invariability of their testimony; for the conversion of the apostle Paul, and of the vast numbers who, like Paul, had once been the bitterest enemies of the cause for which they afterwards laid down their lives. He has to account for a combination of testimony such as the world never saw before. To attempt to discredit this testimony, to throw suspicion upon its veracity, is only to create a necessity of accounting for fresh miracles. He would then have to tell us how it is that the men who changed the face of the world—who achieved

imperishable triumphs in the cause of virtue and of God—whose writings (their enemies being witness) are the purest, the noblest, the sublimest in the world—should have sacrificed ease, and reputation, and life itself, in meanly, basely, palming an imposture on mankind, and proclaiming the truth of a lie. Their success—without the means of success—is itself a miracle. But their efforts—without a motive—is a much greater miracle. Gentlemen! take your choice. Admit the physical miracle which supplies them with a motive; or admit the moral miracle of conduct such as theirs, without a motive! In either case, you get rid of a miracle only by admitting a miracle: a pretty proof that “a miracle is impossible!”

The absurdity of this sophism is at once so thorough, and so many-sided, that from whatever point of view it is regarded, it appears much the same. Confront it with any of those great facts of fossil history, so familiar to us all, and it is speechless. The Christian Sabbath, for example: the Lord’s Day, Sunday; by whatever name we call it, there is the thing. Whence came it? It is the standing monument of a miracle. But if “a miracle is impossible,” then Sunday is a standing monument of—nothing!

And what the Christian Sabbath is to the fact of the Resurrection, that, the Jewish, the patriarchal, the primitive paradisaic Sabbath is to the fact of the Creation. In both we have abiding evidence of miracles. The long train of Sabbaths, and the many generations of men, are indeed parts of the established order of things; but the first Sabbath, like the first man, came in by miracle. What conceivable miracle could be more strange or striking than the creation of the first man? For the miracle of a resurrection we might be in some degree prepared by the analogy of awaking from sleep, or from a trance: but in the creation of a man, we have a phenomenon utterly unlike everything which preceded it. What a violation of the previous “uniformity of nature!” a miracle not more unquestionable than unavoidable! For our opponents do not deny that there *was* a first man. And yet, on their principles they are bound to deny it. For they maintain an absolute

“uniformity of nature ;” i.e. the present order of things was always the order ; and the existing progression is eternal. But if there was a first man, then the progression is not eternal : it began only with that first man. Besides, the uniformity of the progression is violated in another way. The mode of its commencement was one miracle ; the mode of its continuance was another. So that the attempt to evade the necessity of admitting this miracle as miracle, by saying that it took place “according to law,” is doubly futile. For in the first place, in whatever sense the creation of the first man was the result of the operation of Law, in the same sense it may be said of the resurrection and of every other miracle that it also is a result of the operation of some higher Law which seems to us exceptional only because we know nothing about it. But whatever it is called, the thing itself remains the same. In the existence of a first man we have a most undeniable violation of that series of antecedents and consequents which up to the moment of his creation had been the established series ; and that violation comes strictly within the limits of our opponents’ definition of a miracle. But in the second place, the miracle stands alone. The creative act by which our first parents were brought into the world has not been repeated. The first man was created, the second was born.

Nor does this argument for miracles rest upon the creation of man alone. It applies equally to the creation of the first horse, the first worm, the first bird, the first fish, the first tree. In every such instance we have a double miracle. It is a miracle that things should be, which have never been before : and it is a miracle that in the manner of their being they should be diverse from all their successors ever since.

Nor is this all. The existence of the first man involves yet another miracle. In the possession of certain natural faculties his descendants are on a level with himself ; for when he begat a son, it was “in his own image ;” but in the acquisition of those faculties he stands alone. Man has been not ill-defined as “a bundle of habits ;” or, as Burke puts it, a creature who, to a great extent has the making of himself. Thus, for example, we have the faculty of vision ; but the *art* of seeing involves a slow and laborious process, acquired not without the concurrent

exercise of other senses: the *apparatus* for walking is perfect even in an infant; but the *art* of walking is, in fact, a wonderful acquisition. Now, as man comes into the world at present, a long time is required for his development; and during that time he is absolutely dependent on the care of those who have already in their turn required similar care. And the functions which thus task our parents' care, are necessary for our existence, and for any chance of our being able to develop into men. Will any one pretend that the first man was like us in these respects?

If he was, then the miracle which brought him into the world might make him a baby of six feet high, but he would be no more than a baby still. All that was to constitute him a *man*—all those *habits* by which alone his existence was capable of being preserved, and without which he must have perished immediately after his creation—would have to be learned; and his existence during that time—(and a long time it must have been, having no teachers and aids as we have)—must have been preserved by—a miracle. If he were taught by the Creator himself, then we have the miracle in *that* direction. If he were not brought into the world under the same conditions of development as we are, but with *habits ready made* (though that involves a contradiction,) then we have a miracle in *that* direction. If he had his faculties preternaturally quickened and expanded, so as to acquire instantaneously, or possess by instinct, what we acquire by a long and slow process, and not for many years—then we have a miracle in *that* direction. So that whatever supposition be adopted, we still have the actual preservation and development of the first man effected under totally different conditions from those which have formed the *uniform experience* of all his posterity; and so far from any subterfuge of a *law* stepping in, it is a single expedient provided for our first parent alone.

In the face of facts so many, so varied, so obvious as these, can anything be more absurd than the pretence that “a miracle is impossible”?

X. “But even if miracles were possible they could never command our faith.”

How is it then that they *have* commanded the faith of those multitudes who in apostolic days forsook Paganism for Christianity, impelled, in the first instance, by the force of the miracles alone? I say in the first instance, because it is part of the fallacy of this sophism to pretend to sever the divinity of the Revelation from the divinity of the miracle attesting the revelation. It is on the congruity of these two that we rely. The Teaching is worthy to be regarded as Divine. But lest there should be any doubt as to its character it is attested by the Working of a Power which cannot but be Divine. Like His great prototype, the Author of Christianity was “mighty in words and deeds.” “Never man spake like this Man :” that was the tribute to His teaching. And His miracles were the credentials of His teaching : for “if this Man were not of God He could do nothing.” And if a Divine Revelation cannot be attested by miracle, how *can* it be attested!

XI. “But all book-revelation is impossible.”

If this were true, then that would be possible with man which is impossible with God. For it is by means of a “book-revelation” of Mr. Newman’s, that a few visionaries have been led to adopt this dogma that “book revelation is impossible.” Now if, as they pretend, whatever moral and spiritual truth man acquires, he acquires and can acquire only from within, then indeed the external teaching of prophets and apostles is an impertinence : and so is that of Mr. Newman. But if, as his admirers declare, his external teaching has been of the greatest benefit to themselves, it is rather too much to ask us to believe that the similarly external teaching of God Himself can be of no benefit whatever—nay more, that it cannot possibly have any existence ! It is certainly a somewhat grotesque absurdity¹⁸ to pretend that God cannot do what Mr. Newman can do ; and that when it was impossible for Him to give us a book-revelation declaring all book-revelation to be impossible

¹⁸ Yet it is by no means chargeable on Mr. Newman alone. Even Dr. Temple tells us (in Essays and Reviews) that “the faculty of faith

has turned inwards, and cannot now accept any outer manifestations of the truth of God.”

He yet “raised up His servant Newman to perform the office” by doing that very thing !

XII. “Admitting, however, the possibility of external revelation, the actual revelation before us contains incredibilities which are themselves impossible : e.g. that God should authorize the extirpation of the Canaanites ; or that he should inflict eternal punishment upon the wicked.”

To examine these instances in detail.

(I.) “How thankful we must be,” exclaims Bishop Colenso, “that we are no longer obliged to believe, as a matter of fact, the story related in Numbers xxxi., where we are told that a force of 12,000 Israelites slew all the males of the Midianites, took captive all the females and children, seized all their cattle and flocks, and burnt all their cities,” &c. He then adds—“The tragedy of Cawnpore, where 300 were butchered, would sink to nothing, compared with such a massacre, if we were required to believe it.”

Some one told Dr. Johnson that he did not know a certain thing, and that he was thankful he did not know it. The Dr. exclaimed, “You are thankful for your ignorance, are you ?” To which the angry disputant replied, “Yes sir, I am !” “Well then,” curtly rejoined the Doctor, “you have a great deal to be thankful for !”

How much scepticism and disbelief Bishop Colenso means “to be thankful for,” we know not ; but a little will be of small avail. For what good will it do him to be thankful for his disbelief of Numbers xxxi., if he cannot disbelieve 2 Kings xix ? The wholesale slaughter of 185,000 men in one night, was surely as terrible a massacre as that of Midian. But a much harder task is before him. Does he believe that such a city as Jerusalem ever existed ? Does he believe that it was destroyed by Titus ? Does he believe that eleven hundred thousand persons, men, women, and children, perished in this siege, by the most horrible modes of destruction, and that all the survivors were sold into hopeless slavery ? If he does not believe all this, he puts himself beyond the pale of argument. But if he does believe it—if he is not sceptical concerning the deeds of Vespasian and Titus—what does he gain by disbe-

lieving the Books of Kings, or the Books of Moses? If I believe that God shewed himself a God of vengeance in the greater case, what do I gain by rejecting the thought in the smaller? ²²

But Bishop Colenso declares, again and again, his belief in a "God of Providence,"¹⁹ and his certainty that there is such a thing as a "moral government of the world." The question between us is reduced, therefore, to this:—Is there any greater difficulty in the dealings and operations of God as described in the Bible, than we actually find in the dealings and operations of God in the world around us?

The answer to this question is equally unequivocal and undeniable. "He sends forth His pestilence, and produces horrors on which imagination dares not dwell; horrors not only physical, but indirectly moral; often transforming man into something like the fiend so many say he never can become. He sends His famine, and thousands perish,—men and women, and the child that knows not its right hand from its left,—in frightful agonies. He opens the mouth of a volcano, and buries the population of a city in torrents of burning lava. Diseases, in infinite forms, in endless variety of anguish, are racking and torturing myriads of human beings in all ages and countries; apparently without any reference to the moral worth or turpitude of those who suffer. All such phenomena in the works and ways of God are, to all appearance, no less opposed to our conceptions of equity and goodness, than the so-called 'difficulties of Scripture.'^{23 20}

So that, as Bp. Butler has well observed,²¹ "he who denies the Scripture to have been from God upon account of these difficulties, may, for the very same reason, deny the world to have been formed by him." While, on the other hand, as Origen²² has with equal force remarked, "he who believes the Scripture to have proceeded from Him who is the Author of Nature, may well expect to find the same sort of difficulties in

¹⁹ The Pentateuch Examined: Part I. pp. 149, 151.

²⁰ Defence of the Eclipse of Faith: p. 42.

²¹ Introduction to "Analogy."

²² Philocal. p. 23. Ed. Cant.: quoted in "Analogy."

²³ Christian Observer, Dec. 1862.

it as are found in the constitution of Nature." It is therefore not the presence, but the absence of these difficulties which would constitute a valid ground of objection to the Bible. Their existence and their actual character furnish an indispensable (though incidental) guarantee that the Author of Nature and the Author of Scripture are One.

(II.) The doctrine of eternal punishment is rejected both on critical and on moral grounds. On the former, it is averred that the frequent usage of the words 'eternal' and 'everlasting' in a limited sense, warrants the belief that it is in this limited sense only that these words are to be understood when applied to the final retribution of the wicked. On the latter, it is affirmed that the idea of punishment absolutely eternal is incompatible with the benevolence of God.

To the first, we answer, that the averment is true only in part. The part that is material is untrue: and the part that is true is immaterial. It is true that both *עולם* and *αιώνιος* are sometimes used to denote finite periods; but it is not true that this exceptional usage casts any doubt on the normal meaning and application of these words. Besides, it is important to observe, that even the exceptional usage itself serves but, in the strongest manner, to confirm the normal usage. For while this latter denotes a duration lasting literally "for ever," the former denotes a duration lasting as long as the thing of which it is spoken is capable of lasting. Thus, "he shall be thy servant for ever" (De. xv, 17.) though a limited period, is yet a period terminable only with life; and the nature of the subject determines the meaning of the predicate. Precisely in like manner is that meaning shown to be absolutely illimitable and eternal, when we read the solemn declaration of the Most High, "I lift up my hand to heaven, and say, I live for ever!"

This then, is the first part of our case. The words whose meaning is here in question do, beyond all question, bear the primary meaning of an absolute and literal eternity. And when used in a modified and secondary sense they never signify less than a duration as long as ever possible. It now remains to shew that when we speak of "everlasting punish-

ment" or "everlasting fire," we must speak absolutely, if we would speak scripturally.

And this appears not more from the use of single words (though these are the most expressive that can be found,) than from their collocation, and from the interpretation which our Lord Himself has put upon them. The use of the very same word²³ to denote the duration of "life eternal" and of "eternal punishment"—and especially the manner in which these two are contrasted—leaves no room for doubt that this "eternal" is (as our translators have rendered it) "everlasting," lasting for ever. But there are other instances, in which this collocation is still more conclusive. "As the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself." He *is* life—The life: and He came that we might have life. As matter of actual fact those who believe in Him "shall never die."²⁴ His decree has gone forth—"Because I live, ye shall live also." "Neither can they die any more."²⁵ Such is the duration of the ENDLESS reward; such is the measure of the EVERLASTING punishment.

Nor is this all. The eternal Godhead of our Lord is nowhere more fully exhibited than in the writings of St. John. But in those writings there is a specific formula used to denote unending duration. Three times, at least,²⁶ is this formula^{26†} employed to denote the endless life of Him who was "in the beginning."²⁷ But it is the very same formula, used by this very same writer, and expressive therefore of the very same idea, that is employed to denote the duration of future punishment.²⁸ It is essential to the nature of Him who sits upon the throne of the Majesty on high, that He "liveth *for ever and ever*." And—if words have any meaning at all—it is essential to the nature of the future punishment of the wicked, that they "shall be tormented day and night *for ever and ever*." Can anything then be plainer than this consequence?—It is only

²³ Matt. xxv. 46.

²⁴ Jno. xi. 26.

²⁵ Lu. xx. 36., cf. Re. xxi. 4. For "there shall be no more death."

²⁶ Rev. i. 18; iv. 9, 10.

^{26†} εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας τῶν αἰώνων.

²⁷ Cf. Jno. i. 1 with Re. i. 8.

²⁸ Re. xx. 10: cf. Re. xx. 15; and Ma. xxv. 41.

when Christ shall cease to live that the finally impenitent shall cease to die !

Once more : I said that besides this collocation of these awful words, we have our Lord's own comment on their meaning. "I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear : fear him which hath power, after he hath killed, to cast into Gehenna ; yea, I say unto you, fear Him." And what was this Gehenna ? it was the dread abyss "where their worm dieth not, and where their fire is not quenched !" Can language say more ?

On moral grounds, the objection to this doctrine is founded merely on a false assumption. If eternal punishment were the result of an arbitrary exertion of Divine Power, its infliction might then seem incompatible with Divine Benevolence. But instead of this, it is the necessary consequence of a perverted choice on the part of man himself. The very place of punishment was prepared, not for man, but "for the devil and his angels." The Righteous Judge is "not willing that any should perish ;" but since such is our actual moral condition that "except we repent" we must perish, He "now commandeth all men everywhere to repent." "He looketh upon men : and if any say, I have sinned and perverted that which was right, and it profited me not, He will deliver his soul from going into the pit." It was to this end, and for this reason, that "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish." In that sublime manifestation of Himself we see Infinite Benevolence guiding Infinite Power ; "God in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself ;" travelling in the greatness of His strength, "mighty to save !" and crying in the tenderness of His compassion, "Turn ye, Turn ye ! why will ye die ?" What more convincing proof could we have that the doom of those who "neglect so great salvation" is a doom not within the province of Divine Benevolence to avert, but rather within the province of human freedom to avoid ?

But again. The futility and fallacy of the objection now under consideration may be further shewn by observing that it lies quite as strongly against God's works as against His Word. The various forms and causes and conditions of necessary

suffering in our present state of being are innumerable. Yet the objector does not regard this actual suffering as sufficient to warrant our impeachment of the Divine Benevolence. Why then, should he so regard the future suffering so plainly analogous to it? If he answer that that future suffering is described as punitive, while this is not so, we may then call upon Him to consider the obvious analogies furnished by our present condition, and leading us irresistibly to the conclusion that the doctrine assailed is true. For instance:—

Natural punishments are the very frequent consequence of actions which give pleasure at the time: *e.g.*, sickness follows intemperance.

These punishments very frequently outweigh the accompanying pleasure.

The delay of punishment does not imply final impunity, even in this life.

After such delay, the punishment often comes suddenly and violently.

We have a very strong probability, though no direct and certain proof, of punishment following on evil conduct in this world. As a matter of fact however, it is certain that a very large proportion of evil-doers *are* punished here.

The general course of nature shows that after a certain time spent in sin and negligence, there is no place for recovery or repentance, *e.g.*, youth once wasted returns no more; occasions of improvement once lost can never be recalled.

Civil punishments are often final, and inflict death.

Now let these facts (especially the two last) be duly pondered, and then let it be considered whether our actual experience of their truth does not make it in the highest degree probable that there will one day be a complete and literal fulfilment of that terrible doom—"Because I have called, and ye refused, I have stretched out my hand, and no man regarded: but ye have set at nought all my counsel, and would none of my reproof: I also will laugh at your calamity, I will mock when your fear cometh. . . . Then shall they call upon me, but I will not answer; they shall seek me early, but they shall not find me." "For that they hated knowledge, and did not choose the fear of the Lord—*therefore* shall they eat of the

fruit of their own way, and be filled with their own devices ! For the security of the simple shall slay them, and the prosperity of fools shall destroy them ! ”

It thus appears therefore, that whatever objections may be urged against the doctrine of the future punishment of the wicked, as being incompatible with the Divine Benevolence, may, on the very same ground, be urged against the fact of their present punishment. And their futility when opposed to the fact, demonstrates their futility when opposed to the doctrine. In this world men, by their own act and deed, in defiance of warning and experience, do incur punishments which are alike inevitable and irremediable. By their frivolity, their vices, or their crimes, they rush to their own ruin, in mind, body, or estate ; and the inevitable consequences are such as to leave “no place for repentance,” no room for remedy. They are consequences which no sorrow however sincere, no repentance however genuine, no reformation however thorough, can avail to mitigate in the slightest degree. And they are necessary consequences :—as the effect is the necessary consequence of the operation of the cause. Why then, should that be deemed incredible in the world to come, which, in the present world, we see to be actual ?—“ His own iniquities shall take the wicked himself ; and he shall be holden with the cords of his own sins ! ”

Nor is this all. There is another sophism, still more glaring, of which our opponents are guilty. Punishment is but the effect : the cause is SIN. What fallacy can be greater than that of pretending to get rid of the effect without removing the cause ? Yet this is precisely the fallacy of those who deny the eternity of future punishment. It is a most marked and significant characteristic of their special pleading that they have very little to say about Sin ; and that that little is entirely untrue. Sometimes they deny the existence of Sin. Sometimes they say, “ We are no more sinners than God made us.” With very rare exceptions, they speak of sin as lunatics speak of insanity. The thing itself gives them no uneasiness ; but they have an invincible horror of the name. When the poor inmates of a lunatic asylum have a ball, the whole evening passes in

mutual courtesies, music and merriment, and the fearful word "insanity" is breathed by none. When it happens (as I have seen it happen) that all this external propriety is rudely violated by a sudden outbreak of irrepressible madness, each vies with his neighbour in his eagerness to expel the disturber of the agreeable illusion, to forget the disagreeable fact, and to keep up appearances. The counterpart of this conduct has been witnessed by everybody.

Thus Theodore Parker—whom the seven Essayists merely follow—denies the existence of sin. "The Protestant minister," says he, "will believe, or at least command others to believe, that man is born totally depraved, and that God will perpetually slaughter men in hell by the million, *though they had committed no fault*, except that of not believing an absurd doctrine they had never heard of."²⁹ And yet, at the very moment when he was penning this calumny, he knew full well that the doctrine actually held by those "Protestant ministers" whom he was caricaturing was simply that of St. Paul³⁰—a doctrine directly opposed to his own slanderous pretence:—

"God will render to every man *according to his deeds* :— to them who, by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory, and honour and immortality, eternal life ; but to them who do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man *that doeth evil*."

Mr. Wilson asserts³¹ that "if we look abroad into the world and regard the neutral character of the multitude, we are at a loss to apply to them either the promises or the denunciations of revelation :—"an assertion which must be treated as he permits us to treat "the story of a serpent-tempter." It may be poetic ; it may be legendary : but it certainly is not real.

"Neutral" indeed ! and where then is this neutrality to be found ? *Where* is the land to which "the denunciations of revelation" do not apply ? Is it Africa, desolated by the slave-trader, and by the Dahomean Amazons always ravening for

²⁹ Theodore Parker's Experience as a Minister: p. 31. (London, Whitfield, 1860.)

³⁰ Compare with Ro. ii. 6—11, Ma. xvi. 27, and Re. xx. 12.

³¹ Essays and Reviews: p. 206.

blood? Is it India, whose religious festivals are scenes of unutterable abominations, and whose "neutral character" was exhibited in the atrocities of Lucknow and Cawnpore? Is it New Zealand, or the islands of the South Seas, where, before the introduction of "the denunciations of revelation," many a woman used to sleep over the grave of eight or ten murdered infants, slain by her own hands? Is it Turkey, withering and perishing amidst its sins? Or Persia, where the crimes which overwhelmed the Cities of the Plain, still reign supreme? Why, it is not even in those little spots which Christianity has civilized and purified! Even in Theodore Parker's own pages we catch a glimpse of "the tricksy harlot," "the cunning lawyer," and "the client's gainful wickedness." Yes: there are harlots in Boston, and New York, and London, not by twos or threes, but by thousands; and there are those who consort with harlots by tens of thousands; and there are cunning lawyers, and wicked clients, not a few. In what part of these seats of the highest civilization can a man fix his dwelling, where he will not have, within a few hundred yards of him on every side, slaves of lust, whose whole lives are given to debauchery and uncleanness; slaves of covetousness, whose thoughts never dwell on any subject but that of gain; dishonest men, cruel men, and men who live solely for their own selfish gratification?

It is easy for reckless and profane writers to ridicule the idea that "God will slaughter men in hell by the million, though they have committed no fault;" but what is not easy is, how to find an answer to our question, when we ask them, How their system disposes of wicked men, who are not of rare occurrence, and who die in their wickedness in great numbers every year?

They do not pretend that the existence of such men becomes extinct; for Parker himself maintains, as one of the "great primal intuitions of Human Nature," that there is an "instinctive intuition of the Immortal; a consciousness that the essential element of man, the principle of individuality, *never dies.*"³² To say that God takes the vicious as well as the

³² "Experience :" p. 15.

virtuous, the filthy as well as the holy, to dwell with Him in heaven for ever, is to make God unjust, and a rewarder of wickedness. The only third course is, to believe that such are rejected of God; which is just what Scripture tells us; i.e. "that the wicked is driven away in his wickedness;" and "the unprofitable servant" cast into "outer darkness."

It is true that such a state of rejection must be a state of punishment; but this results from the very nature of things. The soul which (by their own admission) "never dies," has passed into the world of spirits unchanged and unforgiven. To such a soul, to meet the eye of God, and to dwell with holy angels, would be the greatest torment conceivable; but it would also be the most *unfit* thing conceivable—the companionship of a seraph, with the character of a fiend;—and therefore, the wicked soul goes "to his own place." And to dwell with other wicked spirits, with unsatisfied lusts, with endless remorse, and never-dying despair—what is this but the inevitable reality of all the most terrible pictures of the future state of the unsaved?

But again. Of the unhappy man who "went to his own place" it is said, not merely, "Woe unto that man!" but much more than that: "Good were it for that man if he had never been born!" If the punishment of the lost were not punishment; if their misery were not penal, but only purgatorial and terminable; then indeed, however full of woe while it lasted, the result would be more full of joy when it was ended. For the purgatorial fire would end; but the future felicity would never end. And thus it never could be good for a man if he had not been born. But the reverse is true: There *are* men who had better never have been born. Is it possible to have a stronger proof that the misery of the lost is misery eternal?

What should we say of a physician who, on being called to the absolute government of a vast lunatic asylum, proceeded to liberate his patients because, as men, they had "a right to be free," and confinement was cruel? Or what of a governor who, from mere good nature, cleared his prisons, regardless of the fact that the inmates were murderers and thieves? Yet this is precisely the absurdity of our opponents! They survey the whole world without ever seeing the Sin which is everywhere! Suffering and sorrow, blood and tears, have for ages been de-

filling every part of God's earth ; but the lofty transcendentalism of these gentlemen knows nothing of the Cause, nothing of the Cure. It hates the very name of Sin—and of Salvation. It loftily tells the poor wretch stifling in the slough of perdition never to mind ; for “though in brothels, or jails, or on gibbets, he is on his way to all that is good and true!”³³ A likely story ! but as to lending him a helping hand meantime, or lifting him out of the mire—how could you suppose it ? It is too weak if it were willing : and it is too stiff to stoop and try !

XIII. “To sever the false from the true, we need a ‘verifying faculty :’ Reason must be the arbiter of Revelation.”

Whose reason ? Those who dislike the supremacy of Revelation are certainly not deficient in reasons for their dislike. But these reasons are so conflicting and contradictory that they annihilate one another. We may make our choice of them ; but whichever we choose, we must reject all the rest. Besides, they are so many and various, their claims are so evenly balanced, and there is such a preponderance of “un-reason” in them all, that a reasonable choice is impossible. There is no lack of reasons ; but there is no reason in any of them.

What reason is it then, to which we must submit the supremacy of Revelation ? Not that of the individual, certainly : for that is confessedly, and of necessity, fallible. Is it the collective reason of our would-be teachers ? They cannot be so absurd. For what is their collective reason but an aggregate accumulation of individual fallibility ? What is it then, that suffices to render fallibility infallible ? Is it only this—that there should be plenty of it ?

Are there things that lie beyond the reach of reason ? Is there any knowledge too high for it ? There may indeed be a few deifiers of Reason who will venture to answer both these questions in the negative. But looking at the great and undeniable mysteries by which we are surrounded—the nature of time and space, the union of matter and spirit in the person of man, the mystery of birth, of life, of death, of free-will, and of moral evil—the mass of mankind will be of a very different

³³ Emerson : “ Representative Men,” p. 68.

opinion. Well then ; there *are* subjects too profound for human reason ; hence the necessity for Divine Revelation. But what absurdity can be greater than to make this Reason, confessedly circumscribed and shallow, the arbiter of a Revelation which treats of subjects illimitable and profound ?

The “verifying faculty” is the same absurdity in another guise. It verifies nothing. It falsifies everything. It proves for one man what it disproves for another. For Dr. Davidson it stamps a Levitical law with the impress of truth : for Dr. Colenso it stamps the very same law with the impress of falsehood. Its operations may well be variable while its nature is unknown. Yet no one can tell what it is. It is the voice of reason, says one ; of conscience, says another ; of the moral intuitions, says a third. Theodore Parker and Mr. Newman are quite agreed that from these “intuitions” there is no appeal ; but as to what these intuitions are, or how many there are, they find agreement to be a thing impossible.

Do we then deny and repudiate the authority of reason and conscience ? Far from it : we acknowledge the high authority of both. What we do deny and repudiate is the erroneous assumption that because their authority is great, therefore it must be supreme. Reason is in her own province when examining the evidences which attest Revelation, for these evidences are addressed directly to herself ; but she steps beyond her province when she presumes to pronounce on the contents of that revelation, for of those contents she is in utter ignorance except so far as she has been informed by the revelation itself. Her decisions on matters she is competent to discuss are not without authority, an authority by none more fully recognised than by Revelation itself ; but her conjectures on matters of which her ignorance is her least disqualification can have no claim to that authority which when acting legitimately is properly her own. And we say just the same of Conscience. We hold, with the great Bishop Butler,³⁴ that conscience is supreme over all other powers or principles *within the man* ; but not that it is supreme over a Divine authority

³⁴ Sermons (II. and III.) on Human Nature. (Bohn's Edition, 1852 : pp. 398—414.)

speaking to him *from without*, i.e., by an external revelation. It is this latter which, by the very nature of the case, must rule the man in his conscience, as in all things else, for it is given for this very end. In the words of Professor Whewell, "Conscience, though according to Butler, she has a *natural authority* over appetite, desire, and affection, has not a *Supreme Authority*, but is herself subject to the *Supreme Rule* which enjoins all virtue and duty, and which is, in reality, the *Law of God*."³⁵

In opposition to this however, Dr. Temple tells us that conscience is "the supreme interpreter, whom it may be our duty to enlighten, but whom it can never be our duty to disobey."³⁶ He thus virtually annuls the authority of the Bible altogether, for as Bishop Van Mildert has truly remarked "Whatever be the authority that assumes a power to determine, *suo jure*, the sense of Scripture, that authority itself, if its right be admitted, becomes the rule of faith, and virtually supersedes the other."³⁷ And that this is the sort of authority which Dr. Temple does give to conscience is plain from another passage:—"When conscience and the Bible appear to differ, the pious Christian immediately concludes that he has not really understood the Bible."³⁸ Thus our own vitiated moral sense is to be set up against the plain testimony of God's word; the whole scheme of man's redemption is to be set aside; and all because our conscience does not choose to approve of the plan; though the principle of substitution, and of sacrifice, and the suffering of one for the benefit of another, runs through the whole of God's natural and moral government of the world.

"What God reveals to us," says Mr. Newman, "he reveals *within*, through the medium of our moral and spiritual senses."³⁹ Mr. Carlyle confesses that the world has looked to

³⁵ Preface to Butler's Three Sermons: p. xi.

It should be carefully observed too, that Butler carefully restricts his enquiry to "what is to be collected from our nature." And in this enquiry, he pronounces Conscience to be, not a Judge

above all laws, but a "faculty" supreme over all other faculties.—("Analogy and Sermons," pp. 400, 403.)

³⁶ Essays and Reviews, p. 45.

³⁷ Bampton Lectures, p. 72.

³⁸ Essays and Reviews, p. 44.

³⁹ The Soul, p. 59.

“the revelation without ;” but then he adds, it was “when its beard was not grown as now.”⁴⁰ And in the wake of these gentlemen we have a person of Dr. Temple’s eminence actually enunciating this “new doctrine” as that of St. Paul himself ! “The inner principle,” says he, “is always recognised by him as supreme over the man.”⁴¹ And again :—“The Apostle puts *the inner voice* above all outer voices whatever.”⁴² But how are these statements borne out by fact ? Do they accord with the Apostle’s own representations ? Where is this “inner” principle recognized by him as “supreme over the man ?” Is it in his explicit declaration ?—⁴³ “My conscience does not accuse me of anything ; yet am I not hereby justified ; but he that judgeth me is the Lord.” When “breathing out threatenings and slaughter” he persecuted the Christians to the death, he “verily thought with himself,” i.e., in his conscience, that he was doing God service. How was he “turned from the error of his ways ?” Alas ! for our theorists and the “new doctrine ;” it was by the utterance of an “outer law ;” a voice from heaven, speaking, as Dr. Temple says no “outer voice” can speak, “personally and individually” to his soul. What enormities of wrong, what atrocities of crime, has it not been sought to justify by this very plea of conscience ! If there were no such thing as a bad, a depraved, a seared conscience—if there were no men whose very conscience is defiled—if conscience had escaped the general corruption of man’s nature—then, it might be a safe guide ; but as long as conscience is subservient to the dictates of a sinful heart, as long as conscience is inclined to excuse what the heart is inclined to indulge ; so long must we continue to say “If the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness !” The Jews had no other word for conscience but בַּל the heart : and it is written not only in their law but in ours—“He that trusteth his own heart is a fool !” “My conscience leads me !” said one of these sophists to Archbishop Whately. The reply was worth remembering. “Your conscience leads you ! Yes, just as the horse leads you which you drive before you !”^{43†}

⁴⁰ Carlyle’s Past and Present : pp. 307—312.

⁴¹ “Sermons preached in Rugby

School, in 1858-59-60 : ” p. 257.

⁴² Ibid., p. 255. ⁴³ 1 Co. iv. 4.

^{43†} Christian Observer, June 1861.

XIV. "Since Jesus was human, why should we suppose his teaching to be infallible?"

We may answer this question by another:—Since Jesus was Divine, why should we suppose that His teaching was fallible? But waving this, and turning to the direct answer, we say that the teaching of Jesus was infallible because He was not more truly human than he was superhuman:—"Man, of the substance of his mother, born in the world," but "God, of the substance of The Father, begotten before the worlds." To state this sophism however, in the manner at once most plausible and most forcible, it shall be given in Dr. Colenso's own words. "Nor with St. Luke's expressions before us," says he, "can it be seriously maintained that as an *infant* or *young child* He possessed a knowledge, surpassing that of the most pious and learned adults of His nation, upon the subject of the authorship and age of the different portions of the Pentateuch. At what period then of His life upon earth, is it to be supposed that He had granted to Him, as the Son of Man, *supernaturally*, full and accurate information on these points, so that He should be expected to speak about the Pentateuch in other terms than any other devout Jew of that day could have employed? Why should it be thought that He would speak with certain *Divine* knowledge on this matter, more than upon other matters of ordinary science or history?"⁴⁴

This short passage—no bad specimen of Dr. Colenso's reasoning—abounds with fallacies. When so acute a critic asks us why it should be thought as, in this last sentence of his question he assumes it is thought, he might surely condescend to tell us who it is that thinks so! But is it possible that a critic of his pretensions should be ignorant of the fact that the opinion which he has here attributed to his opponents is no more theirs than it is his own? The distinction here supposed as to the difference in authority between our Lord's utterances as to the Pentateuch, and those relating to "other matters," is none of theirs. The real difference between those who have learned that "The Law of the Lord is perfect," and those who, like Dr. Colenso, think themselves able to mend it, is this,

⁴⁴ The Pentateuch Examined: Part I., Pref. xxxi.

that by the former, all the utterances of our Lord are invested with an authority which, by the latter, is conceded to none.

But even waving this, and supposing for the moment that the assumption on which this question rests were as true as it is false, we have a perfectly sufficient answer to the question itself, in the fact that the authority of the Pentateuch was a matter of incomparably greater importance than any “other matters of ordinary science or history.”

Again: Dr. Colenso declares that it cannot “be seriously maintained that as an infant or young child,” our Blessed Lord “possessed a knowledge surpassing that of the most pious and learned adults of His nation.” Why, the very contrary is the fact! That which Dr. Colenso declares cannot, is precisely the very thing which *can* “be seriously maintained.” It was (in St. Luke’s words) as “an infant or young child” ($\tauὸ παιδίον$) that Jesus “waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom.” It was still as “the child” ($ὁ παῖς$) “twelve years old” that “sitting in the midst of the” “most pious and learned adults of His nation” they “were astonished at his understanding and answers.” It was as a child of that age, that “Joseph and his mother” “were amazed” at him. He still “increased in wisdom,” but even while a child, magnifying the law, and fulfilling all righteousness, He was so essentially different from all other children—not even excepting “the most pious and learned adults of His nation”—that He claimed God for his own proper Father, and resorted to the Temple as His Father’s House.⁴⁵

The fourth fallacy rests upon the third, and therefore with it, falls to the ground. The fifth assumes that our Lord’s knowledge “on these points” was nothing more than a set of opinions necessarily mistaken, because depending on defective and inaccurate “information.” It further assumes that that knowledge must necessarily be “granted to” the Messiah “as the Son of Man,” and that it could only be thus granted

“By all the early writers (and by not a few of the moderns) “ $ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου$ ” was understood to mean “in my Father’s house.” It is so in the Syriac version. (See Fulleri *Miscell.*

Sacr. iv. 17. Palairet: and Schaaf’s Test. Syriacum in loc.) “Our Saviour probably used this expression, because Mary had called Joseph his *father*.” (Burton.)

"supernaturally." But every one of these assumptions is contrary to the actual fact. "With St. Luke's expressions before us," nothing can be plainer than that the Messiah was (and is) "perfect God, and perfect Man," a union of two Natures in One Person. If these natures had been merely co-existent, but not united; if Dr. Colenso had not been as utterly incompetent to draw a line which should separate their operation as he is to explain or understand the union, in his own individual personality, "of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting;" his theory would not then have been so utterly indefensible. But as it now stands, it has not even this solitary fact to rest upon. Notwithstanding all the proofs of His Omniscience with which the Gospels abound; notwithstanding the explicit declaration that "He needed not that any should testify, for He knew what was in man;" notwithstanding his "taking the wise in their own craftiness," and confounding those that came with dilemmas carefully and cunningly prepared "to entangle Him in His talk;" notwithstanding the admission of His enemies, "Never man spake like this Man!" and the significant fact that "no man was able to answer Him a word, neither durst any man from that day forth ask Him any more questions;"* notwithstanding all this, Dr. Colenso would have us believe that the Messiah, the Teacher sent from God, was as circumscribed in the sources of His knowledge as some London detective, who ekes out his own conjectures by the "information" he has received! But could anything be farther from the truth? What was it then that distinguished our Lord's teaching from that of all other teachers? It was not more obviously its extent and depth, than its source. It was not by exhibiting a few scraps of defective "information" that multitudes of hearers were compelled to exclaim, "Whence hath this Man this wisdom?" Nor was it anything less than that very Supernaturalism which so greatly terrifies our modern critics, which extorted the supplemental question, "How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?"

Why does not Dr. Colenso try to answer that question? Is it because there is but one answer possible, and that one is

* Mat. xxii. 46.

disagreeable?—"My doctrine is not mine but His that sent me!"

But lastly: Besides the fact (as already shewn) that the "holy child Jesus" was something more than a child; besides the fact that "the Man Christ Jesus" attributed the unique character of His teaching to its peculiar and absolute divinity; there is the further fact of an external attestation of the same truth. In him are hid "all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge;" for it pleased the Father that in Him should "all fulness" dwell. But that the proof of this should be so manifest as to put the fact itself beyond the possibility of reasonable doubt, The Holy Ghost Himself—the very impersonation of Absolute Omiscience—descends and rests upon "the Son of Man," while, to the witnessing multitudes there comes a Voice from Heaven, saying,—"THIS IS MY BELOVED SON!" "HEAR HIM!"

PART IV.

CERTAINTY.

“AN ARCH-LIKE, STRONG FOUNDATION, TO SUPPORT
THE WEIGHT OF ABSOLUTE, COMPLETE
CONVICTION: HERE, THE MORE WE PRESS, WE STAND
MORE FIRM: WHO MOST EXAMINE MOST BELIEVE.”

YOUNG.

CHAPTER XI.

"No doubt a man may, in broad day, resolutely close his eyes, and assert that it is night. Blindness is much the same as darkness, only the sun still shines in the sky."—PROF. AUBERLEN.

To hear some men talk, one would imagine that the flippant fallacies we have been reviewing are nothing less than the red-hot shot destined to demolish the entire edifice of Christianity. Whereas in truth, they are nothing more than the effervescence of a heated imagination, as hollow and as powerless as the soap-bubbles which secure the admiration of a child, while they glitter for a moment in the sun, and then perish for ever. And this will be abundantly manifest if now, from the specious Sophisms with which it is assailed, we turn to the Certainties, broad and deep, on whose immovable stability its foundations are securely established.

And first, let us consider these four :—

IT IS CERTAIN

- I. That man needs a religion.
- II. That the Christian Religion is perfectly adapted to the actual condition and necessities of mankind.
- III. That THE OBJECTIONS alleged against the Bible, as the Divine Revelation containing that Religion, ARE UNTENABLE.
- IV. That THE REASONS assigned for a belief in the Divine Authority of the Bible, ARE UNANSWERABLE.

I. First then : Man needs a Religion.

The certainty of this truth is demonstrated by three great facts.

1. The first fact is this :—"Man is a *religious* animal ;" he *will* worship. He has been variously and humorously defined

as "a brain," "a stomach," "a machine," "a tail-less monkey," "a bundle of habits," "a combination of gases;" but the most comprehensive and most correct of all these definitions is that first given:—he is "a religious animal." With the cause of this fact, or the reason for it, we are not here concerned. It may be found in man's nature, or condition, or circumstances. It may be a constitutional instinct, it may be a deduction of universal reason, it may be the effect of hereditary tradition descending from the first worshippers through all the tribes of the human family; but whatever may be the cause, whether it be any or all of these, the fact remains the same:—However degraded and imbruted, however barbarous and savage, this religious propensity, in all ages, and in all quarters of the globe, is found to characterize man as man. **He is a religious being: HE WILL WORSHIP.**

2. "Man, by worshipping, becomes assimilated to the moral character of the object which he worships." This is the second fact: and to this fact the whole history of the idolatrous world bears testimony. Without an exception, the character of every nation and tribe of the human family has been formed and modified in a great degree, by the character attributed to their gods. If the worshippers of Thor and Woden were blood-thirsty and cruel, it was because they aspired to imitate the actions and to possess the character attributed to their gods. If the votaries of the hero-deity who after destroying vast numbers of the human race, destroyed himself, thought it disreputable to die in bed, it was because they imagined that a peaceful death might be so obnoxious to a god of violence as to exclude them from the halls of the Valhalla. If "to play the Corinthian" became a synonyme for harlotry, it was because, in her palmiest days, in "Corinth the eye of Greece," the most sacred persons in the city were prostitutes whose very prostitution was in homage of Venus. In attestation of the fact of this debasing assimilation we have the unequivocal testimony of the best writers among the heathen themselves; and its operative principle is plainly asserted by the Buddhist priests of the present day. "Think of Buddha," say they, "and you will be transferred into Buddha. If men pray to Buddha and do not become Buddha, it is because the mouth prays, and not the mind."

3. This process of necessary assimilation has uniformly been also a process of debasement ; and from this debasement (—Christianity apart—) there are no possible means of extrication for mankind. This is the third great fact ; and it is established by the history of idolatry, the testimony of the heathen philosophers, and the actual condition of human nature. After what I have already written on this subject,¹ it is unnecessary to do more than advert to this last point. Human nature, even in its very best specimens is confessedly defective and impure. But who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean ? How then is it possible that man should attribute to the gods of his own imagining, a character better or purer than that which he himself possessed ? The very most that he could do has been expressed by Cicero with a philosophic force surpassing even its eloquence. He could transfer his own imperfect attributes to the gods, and then, by worshipping beings characterized by his own imperfections, he would receive in himself the reaction of his own depravity. He could not avoid assimilation to the objects of his worship. But these objects were uniformly depraved. And they were necessarily so : for they were of his own imagining. And other gods than those of his own imagining he had none. So that as simple matter of fact, the heathen clothed beasts and depraved beings with the attribute of power, and in effect, they worshipped mighty (though not almighty) beasts and devils. And the more they worshipped them, the more they resembled them.

“ Gods partial, changeful, passionate, unjust,
Whose attributes were rage, revenge, and lust ;
Such as the souls of cowards might conceive,
And, formed like tyrants, tyrants would believe.”

It is therefore evident, philosophically and historically, that when left to himself, the corruption of man’s nature is inevitable. He is led to worship by an instinct over which he has no control ; the objects of his worship, self-originated and self-devised, are all of a debasing and corrupting character ; so that the indulgence of his instinctive propensities inevitably strengthens the corruption of his nature. O wretched man !

¹ “ Voices from the Sanctuary.” pp. 108—116.

who shall deliver him? It is the exclusive prerogative of “the glorious gospel of the blessed God,” to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the doors to them that are bound.

II. It is certain

That the Christian Religion is perfectly adapted to the actual condition and necessities of mankind. This adaptation is demonstrated in these two particulars:—First, Christianity reveals a Pure Object of Worship; secondly, it accompanies this revelation with a bestowal of Power;—a power sufficient to detach the worshipper from the debasing service of his false gods, and to attach him to the elevating service of that One who alone is True. When man’s instinctive worship is paid to a Pure and Worthy Object, his rescue and reformation become, for the first time, possible. And then the process is completed by the transforming efficacy of the assimilating power, by which the possible becomes the actual. To reveal that ennobling Object, and to bestow that transforming Power, are the glorious and distinctive characteristics of the Christian Religion, and of that religion alone.

He who would see a demonstration of the adequacy of Christianity in its perfect Fitness and Adaptation to the necessities of mankind, may find it in a comparison of Christendom with heathendom.² The demonstration of the Power by which that fitness is accompanied, is to be found in every land to which Christianity has come. When St. Paul first set foot at Philippi, there was not a city in Europe which had not its own idolatrous shrines; but now, centuries, and even kingdoms, have passed away since the last idolatrous temple was demolished by the spiritual power of the Christian Religion. What were the South Sea Islanders before the introduction of Christianity? What were the aborigines of New Zealand? And what are they now? They are the “commendatory letters” of Christianity; “living epistles” known and read of all men; a tangible and evidential demonstration of the perfect adaptation to the neces-

² See “Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation,” pp. 1—15. Also, “Ireland on Paganism.”

sities of mankind which characterizes the religion of the Bible : a religion that comes “ not in word, but in Power.”

III. It is certain

That the objections alleged against the Bible are untenable.

1. The Bible, we are told, abounds with Difficulties.

Without doubt it does ; and so does everything else in this world. The natural processes connected with the transformations of matter—the organic from the inorganic—the dull earth and the viewless air transmuted into leaf, and flower, and fruit, and woody fibre, not to speak of vital heat, “ the blood which is the life,” or all the curious mechanism of eye and ear—all these are beset with Difficulties innumerable, and Mysteries incomprehensible. If from the region of matter we ascend to the region of mind, our difficulties are increased both in number and magnitude. We know of Gravitation nothing but the fact and the name. Of Volition we know, if possible, still less. But how it is that the force of volition can arrest and counteract the force of gravitation ; of this we know nothing at all. From mental to moral questions the ascent becomes more steep as it becomes more high. We are “ of yesterday : ” is it for us to scale the throne of The Eternal ? We do not understand the commonest elements of “ earthly things : ” is it for us to fret and fume because forsooth, we cannot comprehend the sublimest mysteries of “ heavenly things ? ”

We therefore not only admit the existence of these difficulties, but we maintain that their presence in the Bible not less than in the World is a strong reason for believing in the common origin of both. Besides, the thoroughly untenable character of this objection will sufficiently appear from these two considerations alone :—

First, The principal difficulties of the Bible are not peculiar to the Bible. They would all continue in full force, if the Bible were extinct to-morrow. They constituted the chief perplexities of enquiring minds before the Bible existed. The mysteries of moral evil, of free-will, of Divine Sovereignty, of the nature and necessity of future rewards and punishments, are indeed of a higher order, but not of a more real nature, than the mysteries inseparable from the abstract idea of infinity,

or the concrete ideas of infinite extension, infinite duration, or Infinite Being. They are mysteries inseparable from the vastness and the grandeur of the subjects themselves. The Bible did not create them, but it does diminish them ; and if it does not altogether dispel them, it is only because the finiteness of man is not yet able to comprehend the infinity of God !

But secondly : If even these alleged difficulties were peculiar to the Bible : what then ? Why, then the objection amounts to this :—“The Bible teaches much—very much—more than any other book in the world—that is excellent ; but it also teaches some things that are difficult : it shall be easy, as well as excellent, or I will have none of it !” Is such an objection worthy of an answer ? What is it but to set up the pretensions of ignorance against the authority of knowledge ? Our opponents admit the excellence of the Bible as fully as we admit its difficulties. But difficulty is merely another name for ignorance. Is it rational to take that which we do know, and to make it depend on that which we do not know ? Are we to doubt whether we know anything, because forsooth we do not know everything ? If not, then to urge the difficulties of the Bible in depreciation of its acknowledged excellence, is to raise an objection as irrational as it is untenable.

2. But it abounds with Contradictions.

No doubt it does : with *such* contradictions as are found in all true histories ; such contradictions as were never found in any false history whatever ; such contradictions, *and such only*, as serve to give the strongest corroboration of its truth. In support of this statement, and in illustration of the merely apparent character of those contradictions which when found in Holy Scripture are proclaimed by our opponents to be absolute and final, it will not be irrelevant to cite here a striking example given by Ebrard³ of the manner in which the same fact has impressed itself on different eye-witnesses.

“On the evening of September 5th, 1839, a rumour prevailed in Zurich, that an attack was to be apprehended from an armed force of Bernese. The greatest commotion was excited, and a body of men was drawn together in the district of Pfäff-

³ And quoted by “Lee on Inspiration.”

kon to repel the attack. The rumour was soon found to be without any foundation, and means were taken by the Government to allay the popular tumult.

“On subsequently enquiring as to these events, Ebrard was informed by one person, that the Government dispatched N., one of their number, at a late hour, with a letter to Pfäffikon ; on another occasion, Ebrard was told, by a second informant, that N., after going a short distance, *returned* with the intelligence that the tocsin was already ringing in Pfäffikon. A third related that *two persons* on horseback had been dispatched ; while a fourth averred that N. *had sent* two messengers on horseback to the disturbed district.

“If ever four accounts *appear* irreconcilable, these are so. And if a harmonist were to conjecture that N. had been sent to Pfäffikon ; that he had been met on the Zurichberg by two peasants, coming from that place, with the intelligence that the people were already on the march ; that he had returned with them to Zurich, and, entering the neighbouring house of a magistrate, had caused two horses to be at once saddled, and commanded the peasants to ride back in haste, to proclaim peace ;—all this would, no doubt, be set down as a highly improbable and artificial conjecture. And yet it is no conjecture, but the simple, true account, which N. *himself* gave me, when I asked *him* about that event.”

We rest the demonstration of the untenability of the objection we are now considering, on these facts :—

First, The “contradictions” alleged against the Bible are, in no case more irreconcilable than these of Ebrard’s ; but these are not irreconcilable at all.

Second, These contradictions arise from omission, not from opposition. Each account is true as far as it goes ; and the seeming conflict becomes actual concord as soon as we are in possession of *the whole truth*.

Third, The usual character of human testimony is *substantial truth* under *circumstantial variety* : and this guarantee of veracity is precisely what we find in the Bible.

Fourth, It is certain that if the Bible histories had been fictitious, the forgers of those histories would have taken good

care—by avoiding all appearance of contradiction—to obviate all objections on this score.

Fifth, If it be said that the Bible narratives may be forgeries after all, and that these contradictions have been inserted to simulate the appearance of truth; then the objection refutes itself: for no contradictions can be a mark of truth and a mark of falsehood at the same time.

3. But the Bible is of double meaning, and of doubtful interpretation.

And so (as we have already seen) are Shakspeare and Dante; but who ever thought of alleging this as a ground of objection against them? If even the studied severity of the language employed in framing Acts of Parliament is not sufficiently rigid to exclude double meanings and doubtful interpretations, where shall we look for a rigidity sufficiently precise? Not in the language of daily life, for that is the language of figure. Not in the language of nature, for that is poetry. If, in the stinging words which King John addresses to Hubert, Shakspeare intended his hearers to understand what words they were in which Queen Elizabeth might address Davison, what is this but a proof of the far-seeing wisdom and the far-reaching power of the author? And in like manner, when Solomon describes the doom of the wicked in terms which apply perhaps almost equally to this life, and to the life to come, we have—what in any other case would be regarded as an excellence, not a defect—a convincing reason for our belief in the profundity and power of that Great Spirit by whom the words were indited. This then is the first part of our answer:—

If the Bible—speaking not to angels, but to man—not of things natural merely, but of the supernatural—not of theoretic abstractions which amuse a few, but of stern realities which concern the mass of mankind—appealing to their highest reason—involving their eternal interests—had, notwithstanding, said nothing that might be shewn to have a double meaning, or nothing that might be said to be of doubtful interpretation, it would have utterly defeated its own purpose: for it would have been a book which no one would read; a book which no one would care to understand. It would have been so

thoroughly non-natural, as to constitute a miracle—which these objectors are anxious, of all things, to avoid.

But again: The objection is neutralized by the fact that the uncertainty here objected to, is so clearly limited and defined that nothing less than culpable ignorance or wilful perversity can cause dangerous (because erroneous) interpretations. The Principles and Rules of Interpretation have been already enunciated; and as an illustration of what we mean when we speak of the “double meaning” of Scripture we will take a passage selected by Professor Jowett himself. “The time will come when educated men will no more be able to believe that the words, ‘out of Egypt have I called my son’ (Matt. ii. 15; Hosea xi. 1) were *intended* by the prophet to refer to the return of Joseph and Mary from Egypt, than they are now able to believe the Roman Catholic explanation of Gen. iii. 15. ‘Ipsa conteret caput tuum.’”⁴

The answer is very short and very simple. The Greek Professor is here guilty of a gross misrepresentation, a glaring sophism. The time will come, he tells us, when educated men will cease to believe a certain dogma. But he cannot, meantime, produce a single example of an educated man who does now believe it, or who ever did believe it. That which he attributes to his opponents has simply no existence except in his own imagination. It will be rather difficult for “educated men,” or indeed for any class of men to cease to believe that which they never have believed. The true representation of the matter is this:—

There is no reason for supposing that Hosea intended the words “I called my son out of Egypt” to have any other reference than to the historical fact of the Exodus, seven hundred and fifty years before. The “Son” called out of Egypt was the “Israel” who was loved as “a child.” This was certainly the sense (and, as far as we can ascertain, this was the only sense) in which the words were or could be understood by the hearers at the time, or by the readers for seven hundred and fifty years afterwards.

But at the end of that time St. Matthew, with a Divine

⁴ Essays and Reviews, p. 418. (The italics are Professor Jowett's.)

authorization not less than that of Hosea, was directed to write another portion of that Holy Scripture the whole of which is given by Inspiration of God. In so doing he has occasion to record the return from Egypt of One who was in the strictest sense God's Son, His only Son. He is at once led to see that in this event the words of Hosea find an application incomparably higher than that which they had hitherto received. But this is not all. He is also taught that although Hosea might not have intended to use words fraught with so deep a meaning, yet the Author of Scripture and the Over-ruler of events intended it. Hosea writing, thought only of the historic meaning; but the Holy Ghost inditing, intended the deeper prophetic meaning which Matthew should, in due time, be commissioned with authority to unfold. The first meaning is not less true than the second, but the second has a grandeur and a glory to which the first has no pretensions.

Here then, we have unquestionably a Scripture with a "double meaning :" and this meaning intended (not indeed by the amanuensis, but) by the Author. But there is no double meaning in the sense of the objection now considered. **THERE IS NO UNCERTAINTY**; and no room for any. The first meaning is simply and literally true: and the second is not left to be elicited by any guessing of private interpretation, but is uttered by the same authority as that which at first took care that prophecy should come "not by the will of man." The return from Egypt was not merely an event to which it was possible to accommodate Hosea's words; but an event which happened because by those words it had been foretold: an event which happened "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet." Just as when Moses issues the literal precept "Neither shall ye break a bone thereof" (Ex. xii. 46), it is left for St. John to show us (on Divine authority) that for fifteen centuries these words had conveyed a latent but prophetic prefiguration of the sacrifice of "Christ our Passover" on Calvary, and that what was there done, was done "that the Scripture should be fulfilled, A bone of Him shall not be broken."

4. But the Bible contains statements which are scientifically untrue.

The very reverse of this is the fact. We repel this charge by saying that the charge itself is untrue, and we verify our assertion by an appeal to the actual facts already adduced. We fully admit that the language of the Bible on scientific as on other topics is the language of common life ; that it describes things as they appear ; that it therefore presents us with relative, rather than with absolute truth. But we have already shewn that the most scientific forms of speech are liable to the same impeachment.⁵ They all describe appearances ; they all present us with relative, rather than absolute truth. If therefore the language of the Bible is unscientific, so is the language of Science herself.

But the force, or feebleness, of this objection to the Divine Inspiration of the Bible, is a question after all not of words, but of things. In the geological debate at Tamworth it is true that, regarded as a question of words, blunt George Stephenson had no chance when opposed to the polished Dr. Buckland : but underneath those bungling, stammering, hesitating words, there were truths that could bide their time. And when, by the espousal of Stephenson's argument, on the part of Sir W. Follett, the question ceased to be one of words, and Dr. Buckland was vanquished ; it was by the sheer force of those very facts which Stephenson knew to be true—and which he knew also would in due time appear to be what in fact they were. We ask then, as to the question before us, what is the verdict on the merits ? what are the actual facts ? And the answer is this :—

It is certain

(1.) That in no single instance has it ever yet been proved that the established facts of any one of the sciences are at variance with the statements of the Bible.

(2.) That on the contrary, between those statements on the one hand, and the established facts of science on the other, there exists a substantial agreement, so extensive and so minute as to furnish one of the strongest reasons for believing that the Author of Nature and the Author of Scripture are One.

⁵ *Vide supra*, p. 187.

(3.) This agreement is the more evident and striking when viewed in contrast to the scientific teaching of all false religions, of all the ancient pagan philosophers, and of not a few among the moderns.

(4.) Last, but not least, The language of the Bible on scientific (as also on prophetic) subjects is germinant, and is so framed as to adapt itself to the successive advances of scientific discovery.

The infidel writers of France were wont (not very long ago) to make merry with the Biblical record of the creation of light before the sun. Here unquestionably Scripture and Science (?!) were at variance. Then so much the worse for science ! True Science has now come in homage to the Scripture ; and by the adoption of the undulatory theory⁶ has confessed that the Bible was right after all. *Ab uno discit omnes.*

IV. It is certain

That the reasons assigned for a belief in the Divine Authority of the Bible are unanswerable.

An elaboration of all these would be a library in itself : it will be sufficient for the purpose of the argument, to enumerate a few. And foremost in this array, are those furnished by the external history and the internal character of the Bible itself.

1. The history of the Bible is a history without a parallel. The people to whose care the larger and earlier portions of it were committed have been for ages a despised and down-trodden race. Midianites and Philistines, Syrians and Egyptians, Assyrians and Chaldeans, each contributed something to the final catastrophe under Titus ; and yet that catastrophe was but the precursor of that deeper degradation and that more embittered hate which followed the dispersed Jews through every country of Europe. But it was not, after all, from without but from within, that the greatest perils were incurred by the Bible. For the Bible was a perpetual protest against the idolatry to which both princes and people were

⁶ According to this theory, the substance of light is a subtle ether, which becomes luminous only by agitation : the sun being the agent in communicating the necessary wave-like impulse.

inclined. And thus it happened that the preservation of the Sacred Volume was in greater danger from Jeroboam and Jezebel, than from Sennacherib or Nebuchadnezzar. The preservation (of the New Testament also) in modern times has, if possible, been more wonderful still. The atrocities of Popery have rivalled those of Antiochus Epiphanes himself. Go to every land where Popery has had power, and you will find abundant proofs that if the Papal fire, and sword, and rack, and gibbet could have destroyed the Bible, it had long ago been done. But the Bible still survives. Not in an odd copy here and there, but in many millions, scattered over every degree of longitude on the face of the globe, and making known to more than a hundred and twenty different nations, in their own vernacular tongues “the wonderful works of God.”

Nor is this all. The Bible has been not merely preserved ; it has been preserved unaltered. The Samaritan Pentateuch, the LXX., and the many hundred MSS. which have been collated, both of the originals and of the Versions (as already shewn) establish the fact. And then this Book thus strangely preserved from extinction and from corruption, contains within itself a power of reproduction peculiar to itself alone. The wide spreading banyan gives but a very faint and inadequate idea of the wide spreading Bible ; and, to adduce but a single trophy of its vitality and power, we have in the existence, the operations, and the achievements of The Bible Society, a phenomenon unparalleled in the annals of mankind.

That amid the universal wreck which befel the literature of the most polished nations of antiquity cotemporary with Moses, this book alone should survive ; that it should thus survive notwithstanding the mightiest efforts in later times, to destroy it from off the face of the earth ; that it should continue not merely unmutilated, but also uncorrupted ; that thus, preserved and pure, it should be found at this day, not in unintelligible cipher among the curiosities of a museum, but in many lands and many languages, in many millions of copies, dispersed all over the broad globe, guiding the lives of countless multitudes, and influencing the destinies which await the remotest races of mankind ;—what shall we call this ? Is it merely an event in

accordance with the natural course of things? or rather, is it not a most undeniable miracle?

2. Now let us open "the Scriptures" thus marvellously handed down to us, and to a knowledge of their history add a knowledge of their contents: what do we find?

We find that to which no other book can furnish anything at all analogous. "Nec viget quidquam simile aut secundum." There is no book, and no collection of books, so interlaced and interwoven one with another; in which one part lends strength and light to another; and above all, none which culminates in a Person whose place in history, as it stands in all the recorded essential features of His Life, Death, and Resurrection, defies the assaults of hostile criticism.

Sixty-six books in one: and between the writer of the first and the writer of the last, an interval of more than fifteen hundred years. David outpouring his immortal psalms when the Grecian States were instituting the Amphictyonic Council; and Isaiah his immortal prophecies when Romulus was watching for the vultures on the Palatine Hill. Moses writing his primeval history

"When the Memnonium was in all its glory;"

and John depicting the Apocalyptic vision when the Temple which had been "forty and six years in building" was a heap of ashes and ruins. Among writers thus separated collusion was impossible; and yet their various productions present us with a combination, a concord, a harmony, which is nowhere else to be found. To estimate this wonderful agreement aright, consider the subjects of which these writers treat. Subjects at once the most sublime, the most profound, the most difficult, and the most important, that can be imagined. Subjects on which the greatest oracles of this world's wisdom have guessed and blundered, and differed and disputed, and contradicted themselves and one another, from Sanchoniathon to Swedenborg, and from Jannes to Dr. Child. Consider too the diversity in natural ability, in literary acquisition, in mental habitudes, presented by kings, statesmen, shepherds, scribes, herdsmen, fishermen, tax-gatherers and tent-makers. Yet such were the writers of the Bible. Add to this the multiform characters of

the unique Mosaic: psalms, proverbs, histories, prophecies, biographies, letters. And then remember that under all these conditions, and through all these agencies, the result is one. The ceremonialism of the law is not opposed to the spirituality of the Gospel. On the contrary, it is necessary to it; as necessary as the scaffolding to the building. The simplicity which characterizes the episode of Ruth is as necessary to the unity of the whole, as the severe reasoning which marks the Epistle to the Hebrews. And despite of discrepancies (whether alleged or actual) there is throughout the whole an agreement so thoroughly circumstantial and minute as to leave no excuse for gainsayers. So true is it that although the utterances were made through the mouths of men, yet the voice was the voice of God; "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."⁷

And besides this agreement, characteristic of the writings, there is the further agreement, characteristic of the writers. With the widest diversity as to the form, manner, and occasion of their utterance, they all breathe the same spirit. Whatever be the immediate subject, the object is one. To glorify God, and "to hide pride from man," "that no flesh should glory in His presence," is their common and their constant aim. "How unlike is it to the ordinary course of man's own spirit or wisdom to dwell upon the downfall of his own works, just at the moment when they come fresh from his hands!"⁸ Yet Moses does this very thing: he foretells that all his laws would be broken,⁹ and he points to a prophet who was to be greater than himself, and who was to supersede his dispensation; but who nevertheless, would be of a different family and even of a different tribe. He himself informs us¹⁰ that he was born of a marriage which, by his own laws would have been considered incestuous. Again, he records without any palliation, the sins of the patriarchs his ancestors; of his brother, Aaron; and of his two eldest sons. He relates also his own sin. From himself we learn that God was once so much displeased with him as to seek to kill him. Three times he mentions the sin which

⁷ Voices from the Sanctuary, pp. 253-4.

⁸ Davison on Prophecy.

⁹ De. xxxi. 29.

¹⁰ Ex. vi. 20.

excluded him from Canaan ; and he records his unsuccessful prayer for the reversal of the sentence.

In the same spirit the Evangelists notice their own faults, and the faults of those whose reputation would reflect credit on themselves. It is from themselves that we learn their ambition, their wounded pride, their “unbelief and hardness of heart,” and the extent to which their prejudices darkened their understanding.

But the truthfulness of the Writers of Scripture appears not only in matters personal to themselves. From Moses to Malachi, what a character is that which the Jewish Church and nation receives at the hand of Jews ! Yet these men were the truest patriots. The difference between them and other historians is, not that they loved their country less, but that they loved truth more. And similarly, the same Apostles and Evangelists who tell us in the strongest terms that the Founder of Christianity was the Creator of all things, “Very God of very God ;” tell us with equal plainness of his low condition ; of his hunger, and thirst, and weariness ; of his dejection, his agony, his death. What stronger proof could they give us of their sacred regard for truth ? If we turn to the Epistles, we find the writers recording without reserve, the scandalous disorders of those very churches which they themselves had planted ; in whose reputation they themselves were involved ; and for whose members they had the strongest affection. St. Peter makes no attempt to extenuate the sin of denying his Lord. St. Paul refers to his former guilt when the subject by no means forces him to do so. He speaks of it in the strongest terms. And when his apostolical authority had been questioned in the churches of Galatia and Corinth, so far is he from any attempt at concealment, that it is from himself alone that we obtain our knowledge of the fact.

The conclusion is irresistible : the Sacred Writers are characteristically distinguished by their uniform regard to truth.¹¹ In

¹¹ See Dr. Whitby's Note on Ep. iv. 25, for the quotations which demonstrate the striking contrast between Christian and Pagan teaching, in this respect. St.

Paul's injunction “ Speak every man TRUTH with his neighbour,” is only the sequel of a very significant preliminary—“ Putting away LYING.” The reprobation of

the words of Bp. Lowth—"While we see other writers ambitious of showing their wit and eloquence, and telling their story in an eloquent, plausible style, a simplicity quite peculiar to itself distinguishes the Bible, forcing on the mind the conviction that these men had no other object than, by a naked manifestation of truth, to commend themselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God."

But the homage thus paid to TRUTH, is paid equally to LOVE, and to HOLINESS. The writers of the Bible, beyond all other men in the world, display the strongest love to their fellow creatures. After twenty-five years of the bitterest persecution, St. Paul still retains the warmest affection for his "kinsmen according to the flesh," by whom that persecution had been inflicted. Moses repays the hatred of those who were "ready to stone" him, by lavishing upon them the incessant assiduities of an affection which, for disinterested devotedness to their welfare, is without a rival. And this spirit of love, this principle of universal benevolence, is by these writers (and by these only) invariably traced to its true source, in the love of God for mankind. With them, love is the sum of human duty; all other commandments are included in this, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself;" and "love is the fulfilling of the law." With them too, (but with them only) love is the only adequate motive to the discharge of duty:—"If God so loved us, we ought also to love one another;" and hence "The love of Christ constraineth us." And then the operation of this love produces holiness: and without holiness no man shall see the Lord. The God of the Bible is "of purer eyes than to behold iniquity," and it is the special and peculiar blessedness of "the pure in heart" that "they shall see God."

And thus the grand and distinguishing characteristic of the Writers of the Bible is found in their uniform and supreme regard for the glory of God. Do they work stupendous miracles? then they are careful to have it clearly understood

the "false tongue," and of "whosoever loveth and maketh a lie" —"Lying lips are an abomination" —"Lying lips shall be cut off:"— What a contrast was all this to

the previous Pagan (as also to the modern Popish) teaching, that lying is not only to be recommended as advantageous, but even enjoined as meritorious!

that it is not by any “power or holiness” of their own. Do they describe the operations of nature? then it is by referring not to nature’s laws, but to their great Author. Do they trace the revolutions of empires? then it is to show the sovereignty of Him who has decreed that by righteousness alone a nation shall be exalted. Is sin denounced as the abominable and accursed thing? then it is because it dishonours God. Is faith the great principle that accomplishes every thing? then it is that boasting may be excluded, and that “he who glorieth may glory in the Lord.” It is the highest style of holy praying—“Father, glorify Thy Name!” as it is the most perfect rule of holy living—“Whether ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God!”

We need not carry this particularization any further.

It is certain

That in its sacred regard for Truth; in its exalted views of the Love of God; in its proclamations of a “holy God,” and in its demand for “holy worship;” in its perfect unity, its boundless variety, and its subordination of all men and all things, all actions, and all events, to the supreme glory of God; the Bible is a Book *sui generis*: a Book so totally unlike all other books, that he who will not be persuaded of its Divine origin by these indubitable signs impressed on every page, will not be persuaded even “though one rose from the dead.”

But now, to fix our attention on a single topic.

3. The prophecies of the Bible prove it to be Divine.

“The evidence of prophecy,” as Bp. Horsley justly remarks, “lies in these two particulars; that events have been predicted which are not within human foresight; and that the accomplishment of predictions has been brought about which must surpass human power and contrivance: the prediction, therefore, was not from man’s sagacity, nor the event from man’s will and design. And then, the goodness of the design, and the intricacy of the contrivance, complete the proof that the whole is of God.”

Now the Bible abounds with prophecies of this sort. Take, for example, those which relate to the fate of Nineveh, Babylon, Tyre, and Egypt; to the dispersion of the Jews; to the extirpation of the Edomites; to the Person and the Work of

Messiah ; and you will find that the records professedly prophetic are strictly and truly so ; that these prophecies were beyond all question uttered at a time long antecedent to the time of their fulfilment ; that between the prophecies and their fulfilment, there is not merely a general, and broad, though marked resemblance, but a most minute and perfectly exact correspondence ; that these prophecies, when uttered, baffled all sagacity and defied all probability ; but when fulfilled, they showed the working of One, as far above man's skill in the design, as beyond the utmost reach of human power in the execution.

When Abraham, in his old age, was lamenting his childless condition, what human sagacity could have discovered that in spite of Sarah's incredulity, and notwithstanding the natural occasion of it, her descendants should yet be a people innumerable as the stars of heaven ? Those predictions most resplendent with the future of the Jewish people were delivered when that people was simply a horde of wanderers in the Wilderness, surrounded by numerous and powerful nations combined to attempt their destruction. Jeremiah's prediction of deliverance was given when ten of the twelve tribes had already disappeared, and the captivity in Babylon threatened the utter destruction of the other two. And yet, to this hour, these people "dwell alone," and are not reckoned among the nations. For more than seventeen hundred years, their land has been trodden under foot of the Gentiles, in verification of the prediction uttered while they were still a nation : unbelievers in Christianity, subjects at once of a dispersion and a preservation without parallel, they still exist as the guardians of those very prophecies which prove the unreasonableness of their unbelief.

Then contrast with this preservation of the Jews, the extirpation of the Edomites. Like the Jews, they were the descendants of Isaac. Of the two races, the Edomites were more likely to have been preserved. They were more warlike. They rose earlier into power ; and they retained that power much longer. They escaped the repeated captivities which desolated Judea ; and when Jerusalem was sacked by Titus, the Edomites were still a powerful and flourishing state. Traces of their former magnificence are found to this day : but nothing more. The

Scripture is fulfilled which said, “There shall not be any remaining of the house of Esau,” “Edom shall be a desolation.” The narrative of Volney is a clearly resounding echo of the prophecy of Jeremiah,—“Esau is not.” And the same records which thus (centuries before the event) marked the opposite fate of the descendants of the twin brothers Jacob and Esau, describe with equal precision the character of those who should be found in Edom after the Edomites had been rooted out. They tell us of the peculiarity of a desolation through which “none shall pass for ever and ever.” And they distinguish between the temporary desolation of Judea, usurped and trodden down, but still retaining much of its ancient fertility ; and the perpetual desolation of Idumæa,—that vast expanse of shifting sand, drifted from the borders of the Red Sea, and inflicting a sterility which can only be compared, as the prophet has himself compared it, to the hopeless barrenness of Sodom and Gomorrah.

Look at the prophecies of Daniel. Their comprehensiveness, their explicitness, their circumstantial correspondence with the events to which they relate, are such as to leave no possible room for objection ; nay more, they are such as to silence all possible objections. The objectors know this full well ; and hence the desperate attempt to shew that they were written not before, but after, the occurrence of the events which they record. The failure of that attempt we have already seen.¹² But that failure is a confession of the validity of our position. It is a confession that the Bible does, at any rate, contain one super-human element ; and that the argument from prophecy is unanswerable. “In the heart of the captivity, in the abyss of the Babylonian bondage, Daniel weighed and numbered the kingdoms of the earth.” There is no denying the fact : but how is it to be accounted for ? The family of Israel are dispersed and lost ; the family of Ishmael—notwithstanding the mightiest efforts of Sesostris and Cyrus, of Pompey and Trajan,—dwell, to this day, in the presence of their enemies. The children of the bondwoman are free : the children of promise, descended from the same ancestor, are conquered and outcast. Throughout all these predictions we have these two things: the agree-

¹² *Vide ante*, pp. 101—114.

ment between the facts foretold and the facts accomplished is perfect ; and yet when these predictions was first uttered, the occurrence of the events which were to verify them was in the highest degree improbable.

But this is not all. These predictions are shewn to be truly divine, not merely by the characteristics now specified, but also by their mutual relation to each other, by their completeness as a whole, and by the dignity and grandeur of the subject to which they are everywhere made subordinate. The kingdoms of the world are made the subjects of prophecy, only so far as their rise and fall is connected with the coming of the kingdom of our God and of His Christ. And although the prophecies of the Bible furnish, by anticipation, a sketch of the history of the world, it is not of its political history, but of its religious progress. Add to this, that no Scriptural Prophecy can be regarded simply as that which foretells : it is also that which instructs. The predictive element is inseparable from the moral. And this inseparability distinguishes “the oracles of God” from all other oracles whatever.

If then, regarding the prophecies of the Bible, we consider their great variety, their absolute and often demonstrated verity, their unity, their continuity, their prodigious extent, the dignity of the Person who is their chief subject, the declared purpose for which this Divine Person came into the world,—to abolish sin and death, to purify and immortalize human nature,—we may well say “Tell ye, bring them near,” that with such evidence can hesitate to receive the Bible as the word of God ; “yea, let them take counsel together : Who hath declared this from ancient time ? who hath told it from that time ? Have not I the Lord ?”¹³

To add but one other reason for faith : It is certain that

4. The Moral Effects of the Bible prove it to be Divine.

That was a capital test for ascertaining the merit of a new candidate for imperial favour—“What has he done ? What has he done ?” Slightly modified it applies equally to nations and to individuals, to systems and to creeds : “By their fruits ye shall know them !”

Now take away from the world the fruits of Christianity, the

¹³ Is. xlvi. 21.

moral effects of the Bible, and what have we left? The ceaseless butchery of men and women which is "The Custom" at Dahomey, at Ashanti, at Fejee? But we shall be told that these people are barbarians, and that though Christianity became extinct, we might still have Civilization. Civilization without Christianity! Well: the Carthaginians had it; and it compelled them to burn to death two hundred children at a time of the best families in Carthage, as a single sacrifice to Saturn. The Romans had it; when infanticide was regulated by the laws of Romulus, and the horrid practice was approved even by Plutarch and Seneca. The Egyptians had it; when the whole nation went into mourning for the death of the bull Apis; and when, in an extreme famine, they chose to eat one another rather than feed on their imaginary deities. The Greeks had it; when the holiest mysteries of Ceres and Bacchus were so full of lewdness that the more any man honoured them, the worse he was himself; and the oftener he worshipped them, the more wicked he became;¹⁴ when Plato, the most unimpeachable among them, describing his model Republic, wrote words which may not be reproduced in English,¹⁵ and gravely proposed to treat men and women as cattle; to regulate their intercourse precisely as the intercourse of animals kept for breeding is regulated; "so that no one shall have a wife of his own," and so that "the parent shall not know his child, nor the child his parent."¹⁶ The Hindus at this day have it; and with it the foul obscenities of the Linga, obscenities which, as an eye witness tells us, are such as to make even an infidel exclaim "Thank God for Christianity!"

In ancient Rome, the capital of the Cæsars, there were all the fatal forms of the disease of Sin: but there was no knowledge of a remedy, no attempt at a cure. There were fallen women, outcast children, the blind and deaf, the sick and

¹⁴ "No one dares to picture to himself the awful state of common social life in the glorious periods of Greece and Rome." St. Paul's description (Rom. i. 22—32) is the nearest approach to it that can be endured. "The

abominations of Paganism are scarcely imagined by the merely English student, and we must not speak one-tenth of the truth concerning them."

¹⁵ De Repub. v. c. 14.

¹⁶ Ibid. v. 457.

destitute, raving madness and ragged poverty ; but from one end of that heathen city to the other there was not one of those institutions for the mitigation or removal of this misery, which abound in modern London. Asylums for the Deaf, and Dumb, and Blind ; Magdalen Asylums ; Orphan Asylums ; Hospitals, Houses of Refuge, Ragged Schools, and Invalid Kitchens ; these and such as these are the characteristic "fruits" of the religion of the Bible, and of that alone. The Divine Power of the Bible would have been plainly proved if it had done nothing more than purify the nations from the pest of licentious gods and goddesses. But besides this, it has brought the knowledge of a "holy God," the gift of a "hallowed" day, with the beauty and the power of "holy worship." It has effected a series of transformations, individual, social, and national, which no other book has ever even attempted ; it has elevated the character, and augmented the happiness, of mankind in an incalculable degree ; its vitality is as unimpaired as in the days of Trajan and Tertullian ; and triumphing over the rancorous hate of its foes, the sphere of its influence is extending, and the trophies of its power are increasing, every day. What need we any further witness ? Can the Effect transcend its Cause ? Is not this, "The Finger of God ? "

CHAPTER XII.

IT IS CERTAIN: THAT IF THE BIBLE BE NOT DIVINE, IT IS AN EFFECT WITHOUT A CAUSE.

“Like some tall cliff that lifts its awful form,
Swell from the vale, and midway leaves the storm ;
Though round its breast the rolling clouds are spread,
Eternal sunshine settles on its head.”—GOLDSMITH.

FOR proof of this assertion we need not have recourse to the Miracles which mark its history, the sublimity which stamps its Prophecy, the wisdom of its Proverbs or the glory of its Psalms ; the simplest prose of its earlier and later portions will furnish proof more than enough : The Institutes of Moses, and The Epistles of St. Paul.

I. 1. In viewing the Mosaic Institutes, there are certain general considerations which deserve a preliminary notice.

To control and harmonize elements so conflicting and discordant as those with which the Hebrew Lawgiver had to deal ; to raise a tumultuous rabble of emancipated serfs and their children to a state of intelligence, civilization, and self respect ; to form them into a consolidated community until they could be settled in a country of their own ; to make them the depositaries of a free government, under a written constitution which distinctly prescribed the duties and secured the privileges of all —duties and privileges both religious and political, public and private, those of the magistrate and of the citizen ; and to effect all this in one generation, was a work accomplished *but once* in the history of the world.

Both the character and the situation of the Jewish People were peculiar. The Jews were to be the sole depositaries of a

pure religion. They were to be kept, in perpetuity, distinct and separate from all the rest of the world. Their institutions, established by Moses, were designed to endure ; and they have endured. They "have withstood the fury of persecution, and the still more dangerous snares of seduction. They are to this day essentially the same in China, in India, in Persia, and in Europe. They may have been neglected, they may have been interpolated, they may have been abused ; but they are the same, and they are still observed. Nor is the claim of consanguinity and brotherhood unfelt throughout the race. Despised and scattered abroad among all nations, they are distinct from all, and bound to each other by ties which the lapse of ages has not destroyed, and has hardly weakened." Their three great annual festivals, their great Sabbath year, their numerous priesthood, their courts of justice, their magistracy, their laws of inheritance, and year of Jubilee, were peculiar institutions, well adapted to secure their national purity in a permanent settlement, but necessarily falling into disuse in a national dispersion. Still, however dispersed, the Jewish People is marked as a separate and a single race, by circumcision, by the annual Passover, by the weekly seventh-day Sabbath, and by the synagogue service for the reading of the sacred books of their fathers.

Now, a mind that could form the conception of a government embodying institutions so peculiar and unique in themselves, so influential in their character, and so durable in their nature ; a mind that—with materials so unpromising as those presented by the character and condition of the Hebrews in the Exodus—could yet devise not merely all the complicated details of this system, but also all the means for carrying it out into practical and effective operation ; a system that should raise its subjects from ignorant barbarism to civilization and refinement ; that should suit their condition when settled in a land that Moses never visited ; that should be still appropriate in the height of their growing prosperity, to be witnessed only in the far-off future ; a system which revolutions, dispersion, and wretchedness have failed to overthrow, and which Time itself does not efface ;—we say that a mind which conceived and carried into effect, such a system in all its vastness, and in all its minute-

ness, was a mind superhuman. We say more: in the resources it displays—in the far-seeing wisdom and in the far-reaching power—we see the proof that such a system is of God. There is nothing like it in the annals of mankind.

2. Look at its laws; ceremonial, civil, ecclesiastical: where shall we find anything like them? Law is the slow growth of ages; the index of public intelligence; the standard of civilization. All history shows that the advance from barbarism to that condition in which government is administered in strict accordance with written law, is very slow; it requires a long course of years. Laws are usually enacted cautiously, one after another, as the exigencies arise that call for them; and the alteration, amendment, or repeal of old laws is constantly taking place. But the laws of Moses—bearing the stamp of a vigorous and a comprehensive mind, revealing a political sagacity, as keen as it was profound—laws which settled the entire government of a great people, and settled it on an enduring foundation—these were produced at once. And it is especially to be observed that this distinctive excellence is inseparable from their distinctive character. If they possess any features in common with other codes it is not to these that their superiority is traceable. Their superiority is the result of their peculiarity. Take, for example, this great fundamental principle, the Supreme Sovereignty of the One Only God. Or take that singularly admirable device for making private vengeance subordinate to public law—the appointment of the six Cities of Refuge. The singularity of principles and of enactments such as these can only be compared with their success. And both together go far to prove that there was “no people who had God so nigh to them.”¹

3. But it is in The Moral Law especially that this perfection and this peculiarity most manifestly appear.

The teaching of sages and philosophers, on the subject of human duty, have usually been prolix and obscure. In every age and country they have been so shrouded in mystery as to be nearly unintelligible to the great mass of mankind. But in

¹ See “The Pentateuch and Its Assailants,” by Dr. Hamilton of Mobile, Ala. (Edin. Clark, 1852; pp. 18 et seqq.)

the Decalogue promulgated by Moses we have the entire range of human duties comprised in a compass so brief that a child may commit the whole to memory in a few hours, and yet so comprehensive that ages of human legislation have found nothing to add. In the principles it inculcates, in the practices which it enjoins, in its distinctness, its emphasis, its brevity, its intelligibility, we see at once its Divine origin and its universal application. It is no mere adaptation to the circumstances or condition of any one class of society, any one race of men, or any one age of the world. It is pre-eminently the Law for Man, in all ages, in all countries, and in every condition of life.

Look at it again : with its threefold division of duty.²

a. Duty to God.

a. Your Maker must be the highest object of your interest and affection. Make it your constant desire and endeavour to please Him and obey His commands.

β. You shall never speak of Him lightly or with irreverence ; and you shall not regard any visible object as being a representation of Him. For He is a Spirit (and therefore invisible) and will accept only spiritual worship.

γ. For that worship consecrate one day in seven ; and for this purpose, entirely suspend all worldly employments.

b. To Parents you owe a special duty, arising out of a special relation. Regard them as God's vicegerents. Habitually honor and obey them. Invariably treat them with respect and affection.

c. Duty to all others.

Keep constantly in view their welfare and happiness, as well as your own. To this end, have a conscientious respect for their rights, in regard to

a. The security of life ;

β. The peace and happiness of the family ;

γ. Property ;

δ. Reputation.

And in all this you must regulate your heart as well as your

² Abridged (with some alteration) from Abbott's "Corner Stone," p. 68.

conduct. God forbids the unholy desire, not less than the unholy action.

Such is God's Moral Law: the law first published by Moses, reiterated by prophets and apostles, illustrated by Him who came not to destroy the Law but to fulfil,—that greater Prophet to whom Moses himself pointed, saying, "Him shall ye hear in all things." This Law is a distinctive characteristic of the Bible; it is peculiar to the Bible alone; and we may triumphantly ask, where is the statesman or philosopher who can mend it? The wisest assembly of statesmen or legislators ever convened, if called together to form a code for the world, to apply to every nation, and to operate through all time, could not have made a better selection of points to be brought forward, could not have arranged them with more logical precision, or expressed them in clearer terms. And yet the Rationalist (!) would have us believe that they were the production of a half-civilized leader of a wandering horde—contrived just to assist their author in maintaining an influence over his semi-barbarous followers!

No political revolutions, no rise or fall of powerful dynasties, no changes in the aspect of society, can ever add to the force or impair the authority of this noble law. It is based on principles, and it deals with relations that are unchangeable. To the white man and the black, to the beggar and the king, to the profound philosopher and the plodding peasant, it is alike and invariably applicable. No advances in science can dim its lustre, no lapse of ages can impair its force. Issuing as it did, in a remote, a superstitious, and a barbarous age, it still presents an embodiment of wisdom never surpassed, never equalled, and to this hour it constitutes the acknowledged basis of all wise and efficient legislation in every civilized country under heaven.

Whence came it—if not from "the finger of God"?

II. From the great prophet of the Old Testament, turn now to the great apostle of the New. Read the Epistles of St. Paul, and then—if it be possible—refute, or deny, or account for, the demonstration they furnish of a supernatural element in Holy

Scripture. Tacitus indeed, supremely ignorant of Christianity, its nature, its character, its claims—regarding the Jews as more absurdly superstitious than the devotees of the six hundred different religions that swarmed at Rome ; gravely reporting them (as matter of history) to have worshipped the effigy of an ass—and regarding the Christians merely as a sect of the odious and contemptible Jews—pronounced the new religion to be (“exitibilis superstitione”) a pernicious superstition.” “A poor young man executed at Jerusalem, with two thieves upon a cross,” to be the Redeemer and the destined Judge of the human race ! Grace, redemption, regeneration, atonement, mediation : Truly, the new religion brought strange things to his ears. It was made up of points he had never thought of ; of terms he had never heard. That he should reject it without examination was not wonderful, when we consider how natural was his strong antecedent contempt for its professors and preachers ; but what shall we say of those who, imitating him in the rejection of it, (a rejection without examination,) are utterly opposed to him in their loud laudation of its undeniable moral excellence ? For no unbeliever of the present age would apply to the Christianity of the New Testament the epithet applied to it by Tacitus ; none but would allow that it was entirely unmerited. Read the instructions given by a great teacher of Christianity, to those very Roman converts of whom Tacitus speaks ; and given also a very few years before the time of which he is speaking ; instructions, let it be observed, which are not “a collection of fine sayings brought together from different parts of a large work, but stand in one entire passage of a public letter, without the intermixture of a single thought which is frivolous or exceptionable” :—

“ Abhor that which is evil ; cleave to that which is good. Be kindly affectioned one to another with brotherly love ; in honour preferring one another : Not slothful in business ; fervent in spirit ; serving the Lord : Rejoicing in hope ; patient in tribulation ; continuing instant in prayer ; Distributing to the necessity of saints ; given to hospitality. Bless them which persecute you : bless, and curse not. Rejoice with them that do rejoice, and weep with them that weep. Be of the same mind one toward another. Mind not high things, but

condescend to men of low estate. Be not wise in your own conceits. Recompense no man evil for evil. Provide things honest in the sight of all men. If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men. Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath : for it is written, Vengeance is mine ; I will repay, saith the Lord. Therefore, if thine enemy hunger, feed him ; if he thirst, give him drink ; for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good.

“ Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God ; the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God ; and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power ? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same ; For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid ; for he beareth not the sword in vain : for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. For for this cause pay ye tribute also ; for they are God’s ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues ; tribute to whom tribute is due ; custom to whom custom ; fear to whom fear ; honour to whom honour.

“ Owe no man anything, but to love one another ; for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet ; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbour ; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law.

“ And that, knowing the time, that now it is high time to awake out of sleep, for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed. The night is far spent, the day is at hand ; let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light. Let us walk honestly, as in the day ; not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying.”

“ Read this, and then think of ‘exitibilis superstition !’ ” Read it, and remember that, by the confession of our adversaries, it was literally and illustriously exemplified in the common daily life of the early Christians, and then account for it

—if you can. When the younger Pliny was led by his office to institute something like an examination into the conduct and principles of the new sect “everywhere spoken against,” he discovered nothing but that they “were wont to meet together on a stated day before it was light, and sing among themselves a hymn to Christ as a God, and to bind themselves by a solemn oath, not to the commission of any wickedness, but not to be guilty of any fraud, robbery, or adultery, never to falsify their word, nor to deny a pledge committed to them, when called upon to return it.”³

Whether therefore, we have respect to the universal prevalence of that transcendent moral excellence by which, as an unfailing characteristic, the early Christians were distinguished ; or to the comprehensive character of those exalted precepts to which it was conformed ; or to the profound sublimity of the motives by which it was originated and sustained ; IT IS CERTAIN, THAT THE MORAL EXCELLENCE OF CHRISTIANITY IS BEYOND ALL COMPARISON. To what cause then should we attribute it ? The stream cannot rise higher than its source : the effect cannot transcend the cause. But, in the case before us, the effect is superhuman ; there is nothing like it in the history of mankind. And it is superhuman too (in kind, and in degree,) in such a way as to make it ABSOLUTELY CERTAIN THAT NO CAUSE COULD PRODUCE IT THAT WAS NOT ITSELF DIVINE.

To fix our attention however, on the single point now under consideration : How are we to account for the fact that precepts and motives such as these, should be urged by “such a one as Paul ?” It is historically certain that in writing this letter to the Christians at Rome, he was preaching the faith he had once done his utmost to destroy. And it is equally certain, that it is impossible to evade the force of this fact in favour of the Religion which could thus transform into its firmest adherents those who had once been its bitterest foes. For the present however, we wave this to proceed to another point. Here is a Jew, in whom all the narrow bigotry of his age and country was conspicuously intensified ; yet he writes to Gentiles, styling

³ Plinii *Epp.* Lib. x. Ep. 97.

them “brethren” and “dearly beloved.” Here is a patriot, whose country is groaning under a foreign yoke: yet he enjoins subjection and obedience to those foreign rulers, as to powers “ordained of God.” “Mind not high things” says he, “but condescend to men of low estate,” and “he that giveth, let him do it with simplicity;” and yet it is certain that “after the strictest sect” of his religion, he had lived a Pharisee! He had travelled post from city to city, “breathing out threatenings and slaughter:” but now he says, “Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good!” for Vengeance belongeth unto God, and “Love is the fulfilling of the Law.” I repeat it: that such precepts and such motives should be found at all in the writings of a Roman in the age of Nero, is a moral phenomenon both singular and striking; but that they should be found in the writings of a Jew, addressed to the conquerors of his country; of a Pharisee addressed to a people “who knew not the Law;” of a man who, distinguished by his rank and learning, was yet more distinguished for his fierce and fiery zeal: this is a phenomenon which, on natural principles, has never yet been accounted for.

Once more. Besides the moral phenomenon of St. Paul’s Epistles, there is a literary phenomenon which deserves our notice. It may perhaps be said however, that whatever be the literary merits of St. Paul’s writings, they are the result of that superior mental culture by which he was distinguished from the rest of the apostles. To obviate this objection we will consider them only in common with the rest of the New Testament.

Who were the writers of the New Testament? They were Galilean Jews: that is to say, they, of all men, were the men least likely to produce a Book of that description. “That Galilean Jews (such as the history of the time represents them), with all their national and inveterate prejudices,—wedded not more to the law of Moses than to their own corruptions of it, bigoted and exclusive beyond all the nations that ever existed, eaten up with the most beggarly superstitions,—should rise to the moral grandeur, the nobility of sentiment, the catholicity of spirit which characterize the Gospel, and above all, to such an ideal of Jesus Christ,—this is a moral anomaly utterly incomprehensible. The improbability of Christianity having its

natural origin in such a source is properly measured by the hatred of the Jews against it, both at that time and ever since. Nor are the *intellectual* anomalies of this problem less inexplicable. Could men, among the most ignorant of a nation sunk in that gross and puerile superstition of which the New Testament itself presents a true picture, and which is reflected in the Jewish literature of that and subsequent ages ;—a nation whose master minds then, and ever since, have given us only such stuff as fills the Talmud ;—could such men have created *such* fictions as those which, according to our opponents, abound in the New Testament—reached such elevated sentiments, or conveyed them in such perfectly original forms : embodied truth so sublime in a style so simple ? “Throughout those writings there is a peculiar tone which belongs to no other compositions of man.” Could *such* men attain this uniform elevation ? Could *such* men have invented those extraordinary fictions—the miracles and the parables ? Could they, in spite of their gross ignorance, have so interwoven the fictitious and the historical as to make the fiction *let into* the history seem a natural part of it ? Could they, above all, have conceived the daring, but glorious project of embodying and dramatizing the ideal of the system they inculcated in the person of Christ ? And yet they have succeeded, though choosing to attempt the wonderful task in a life full of unearthly incidents, which they have somehow wrought into an exquisite harmony ! But even if—in such an age and nation—one such man could have been found equal to all this, is it credible that several (with undeniable individual varieties of manner) were capable of working into the picture similarly unique, but different materials, with similar success, and of reproducing the same portrait, in varying posture and attitude, of the Moral Ideal ? Is it credible that in achieving this task, not one, but several, “were intellectual magicians enough to solve that great problem of producing compositions in a form independent of language—of laying on colours which do not fade by time ; in so much that while Homer, Shakspeare, Milton, suffer grievous wrong the moment their thoughts are transfused into another tongue, these men have written in such a way that their wonderful narrative naturally adapts itself to every dialect under heaven ?” That

the thing has been done is certain ; and that it has been done by these men is also certain ; but if we are asked to believe that these men did it without the special endowment of an Inspiration peculiarly Divine, then it is no longer Christianity that makes a demand upon our Faith, but the infatuation of Scepticism that seeks to impose on our credulity.

He who believes that minds that can *only* produce Talmuds should have conceived such *fictions* as the Gospels, ought no longer to be called an unbeliever. No believer in Christianity believes half as much. Far easier would it be to believe that some dull chronicler of the middle ages composed Shakspeare's Plays, or that a clownish ploughman had written *Paradise Lost* ; only that to parallel the present case, we ought to believe that *four* such ploughmen wrote *four* *Paradise Losts* ! Nor will it mend the matter to say that it was *Christians*, not Jews, who compiled the New Testament ; for they must have been Jews before they were Christians ; and the twofold moral and intellectual problem comes back upon our hands,—to imagine how the *Jewish* mind could have given birth to the *ideas* of Christianity, or have embodied them in such a surpassing form. And as to the intellectual part of the difficulty ; unhappily, abundant proof exists in Christian literature that the early Christians could as little have invented such fictions as the Jews themselves ! “The New Testament is not more different from the writings of Jews, or superior to them, than it is different from the writings of the Fathers, and superior to *them*. It stands alone like the peak of Teneriffe. The Alps amidst the flats of Holland would not present a greater contrast than the New Testament and the Fathers.”⁴ Even Professor Newman—with all his dislike for “book revelation”—is constrained to admit the truth of this important fact. He says, “On the whole, this reading [of the Apostolical Fathers] greatly exalted my sense of the unapproachable greatness of the New Testament. The moral chasm between it and the very earliest Christian writers seemed to me so vast, as only to be accounted for by the doctrine. . . . that the New Testament was dictated by the immediate action of the Holy Spirit.”⁵

⁴ See the passage at length, in “The Eclipse of Faith,” 6th ed., pp. 176—178.

⁵ “Phases of Faith,” p. 25.

We commend this admission to the notice of our adversaries. What they have to account for is the great fact of “THE UN-APPROACHABLE GREATNESS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.”

Let them treat the literary and moral phenomenon presented by this Book as they would treat any other phenomenon. Let their theories be made to fit the facts ; instead of mutilating the facts until they can be compressed within the narrow limits of the theories. Let there be no unworthy attempt to hide the real question by piling up a heap of wordy evasions. Nothing in the world is more certain than “the unapproachable greatness of the New Testament :” Whence came it ? How was it caused ?

“That would be a strange account of a geological stratum, which should omit all reference to the organic remains embedded in it. Science would make short work of a cosmogony—Mosaic or other—that proposed to treat all fossils as so many *lusus naturæ*, which were of no account in the investigation of the history of the globe ; or, worse still, that should suppose them integral parts of the respective strata, and not deposits therein. Now such an interpolated deposit in the section of human history is Christianity ; there it is, fixed immovably in the midst of the centuries,—in them, but not of them ; and those centuries of secular history give no clue to its origin, which must be sought from itself alone.

“It is easy to sketch the rise and fall of empires and races, like the elevation and subsidence of geologic beds, and assign plausible reasons for them ; but this affords no rationale of the world’s history till we account for the unique phenomenon of the New Testament. The problem is this :—Given, the writings of Philo on the one hand, and the Shepherd of Hermas on the other, to account for the interjection of St. John’s gospel and St. Paul’s epistles between them ? Here, we contend, is a manifest interpolation, as demonstrable as that of a fossil in sandstone. It is clearly defined as a distinct and independent organism. Its vitality is self-complete and individual. Philo did not engender it ; Hermas did not continue it. The fossil must tell its own story, or remain a hopeless riddle : the circumjacent sandstone can tell us nothing of its production. What then are we to think of a philosophy that shuts its eyes

to this fossil form ; that gives us an elaborate speculation about the sandstone apart from all allusion to the organic remains, and calls it a theory of the universe ? What, too, of that philosophy which affects to throw aside the fossil as a *lusus* unworthy of serious investigation, and the question of whose origin may be put off with solutions of fantastic absurdity ? When Emerson tells us that transcendentalism, falling upon a superstitious age, makes prophets and apostles ; or when M. Renan refers the greatest moral and intellectual revolution that ever passed over mankind to the monomania of a Jewish peasant ; or when we are asked to believe that the sublimest ethical system the world has known, was the result of a quasi-fraud, perpetrated by men who themselves died for conscience sake, and by whose instrumentality myriads since have done the same ? It is surely not too much to say, that these dreamers stand convicted of the rankest folly by the first principles of the science they are so eager to pervert.”⁶

“ View it in what light we may,” says Theodore Parker, “ the Bible is a very surprising phenomenon. This collection of books has taken such a hold on the world as no other ever did. The literature of Greece, which goes up like incense from that land of temples and heroic deeds, has not half ” (say not a thousandth part) “ the influence of this book from a nation alike despised in ancient and modern times. The sun never sets on its gleaming page. It goes equally into the cottage of the plain man and the palace of the king. It is woven into the literature of the scholar and colours the talk of the street. It enters men’s closets ; it mingles with all the cheerfulness of life. The Bible attends men in their sickness ; the aching head finds a softer pillow when the Bible lies underneath. The mariner escaping from shipwreck clutches this first of his treasures and keeps it sacred to God. It goes with the pedler in his crowded pack, cheers him in the fatigue of eventide, and brightens the freshness of his morning face. It lifts man above himself ; the best of our prayers are in its language, in which our fathers and the patriarchs prayed. The timid man, about to escape from this dream of life, looks through the glass of

⁶ Christian Advocate : vol. iv. p. 153.

scripture, and his eye grows bright ; he fears not to take Death by the hand, and bid farewell to wife and babes and home. Now for all this there must be an adequate cause. That nothing comes of nothing is true all the world over. It is no light thing to hold a thousand hearts, though but for an hour ; what is it then to hold the Christian world, and that for centuries ? Are men fed with chaff and husks ? A thousand famous writers come up in this century, to be forgotten in the next ; but the silver cord of the Bible is not loosed, nor its golden bowl broken, as time chronicles its tens of centuries passed by. Has the human race gone mad ? Some of the greatest institutions seem built upon the Bible ; such things will not stand on heaps of chaff, but on mountains of rock. **WHAT IS THE SECRET CAUSE OF THIS WIDE AND DEEP INFLUENCE ? IT MUST BE FOUND IN THE BIBLE ITSELF, AND MUST BE ADEQUATE TO THE EFFECT.**"

"What need we any further witness ?" The facts admitted by our adversaries are such as, on their principles, have never yet been accounted for. The very admissions which they are compelled to make are sufficient of themselves to establish our case.

It is therefore proved and certain, that "If the Bible be not Divine, it is an Effect without a Cause :"—

"A SACRED PAGE
Where triumphs immortality ; a page
WHICH NOT THE WHOLE CREATION COULD PRODUCE,
WHICH NOT THE CONFLAGRATION SHALL DESTROY."

CHAPTER XIII.

IT IS CERTAIN: THAT THE LIFE OF CHRIST ALONE IS SUFFICIENT TO DEMONSTRATE THE TRUTH OF CHRISTIANITY.

“If the life and death of Socrates were those of a sage, the life and death of Jesus were those of a God.”—ROUSSEAU.

PERFECTLY distinct from the subject to be considered in this chapter, yet closely connected with it, are two others, either of which will be found to furnish sufficient warrant for our faith in Christianity. Yet our faith does not rest on the ground of either alone, but on the combination of both: and it acquires immovable stability from the mutual corroboration which each affords to the other. Christ’s Teaching was unlike all other teaching. Christ’s Miracles were unlike all other miracles. “Never man spake like this Man;” and the works that He did, bare witness of Him, that He was a “Teacher come from God.” And between these two there existed a peculiar and reciprocal fitness and propriety. The Teaching was so sublime as to be worthy of miraculous attestation, and the Miracles were never wrought except for the furtherance of moral ends.

But while it is strictly true that in both these respects the Founder of Christianity is without a parallel, it is not to be denied that those who “will not have this Man to rule over” them have laboured incessantly to find a parallel. True, the moral greatness of Jesus Christ shews Him to be incomparable; yet there have been men who have attempted to compare Him with Socrates. True, the miracles of Jesus Christ are phenomena perfectly unique; yet Hume pretended to think that they might be compared with the occurrences at the tomb of the Abbé Paris.

There is one respect however in which our Lord is not only actually incomparable, but (His enemies themselves being judges) confessedly so. There may be some who have aped His miracles; there may be others who have stolen some scraps of His teaching; but AMONG ALL THE GENERATIONS OF MANKIND THERE IS NOT ONE WHO HAS EVER PRETENDED TO HIS SPOTLESS LIFE.

This then is the special topic to be considered in this chapter. Jesus Christ was absolutely perfect. No other man ever was. No other man ever pretended to be so. The remark is as old as Origen:—"Though innumerable lies and calumnies had been forged against the venerable Jesus, none had dared to charge Him with an intemperance." "Which of you convinceth Me of Sin?" was a question which He alone, of all earth's millions, ever dared to put, and which in His case alone was sure to be followed by silence. Pilate—cross-examining Him as a prisoner at the bar—could find no fault in Him: and what was it that awoke the remorse and despair of Judas? It was his having "betrayed the INNOCENT blood." "Sceptic after sceptic has glared into the character of Christ, searching for a flaw; and sceptic after sceptic has recoiled with the confession that whatever Christianity might be, this Jesus of Nazareth was honest and pure. No character known to history has been subjected to scrutiny so piercing as that of Jesus Christ; and there is no character known to history, except His, of which moral perfection could for a moment be maintained. The proudest names in the annals of philosophic morality are tarnished. Zeno preached a stoical virtue; Diogenes was cynically fierce against shams; but Zeno and Diogenes were personally immoral. Socrates is the loftiest and purest name of antiquity; but suspicions² have in all ages been entertained in reference to the personal morals of Socrates, of a kind which never, even in imagination, darkened the figure of Christ."

¹ Or. *Ep. Cels.* Lib. iii. num. 36. ed Bened.

² The much stronger language of Paley, seems to be nearer to the truth:—"Zeno the stoic, and

Diogenes the cynic, fell into the foulest impurities; of which also Socrates himself was *more than suspected*." (Evidences: Part II. ch. ii.)

Even Plato, with all his high-mindedness, recommended, as we have seen, a community of women. Mohammed is believed by some to have been a sincere reformer ; but the highest that can be said of him is, that in certain points he aimed at the Christian model, while in others he fell infinitely beneath it. "His licentious transgressions of his own licentious rules ; his abuse of the character which he assumed, and of the power which he had acquired, for the purposes of personal and privileged indulgence ; his avowed claim of a special permission from heaven, of unlimited sensuality, is known to every reader, as it is confessed by every writer of the Moslem story." But no vice that has a name can be thought of in connexion with Jesus Christ. Ingenious malignity looks in vain for the faintest trace of self-seeking in His motives ; sensuality shrinks abashed from His celestial purity ; falsehood can leave no stain upon Him who is incarnate truth ; injustice is forgotten beside His errorless equity ; the very possibility of avarice is swallowed up in His benignity and love ; the very idea of ambition is lost in His Divine wisdom and Divine self-abnegation. "This is My beloved Son in whom I am well pleased ;" such was the testimony of God concerning Him. "He hath done all things well ;" such was the fond and wondering attestation of men that they could require no more of Him. To enumerate the features of His moral grandeur would be to catalogue perfection. His virtues are those of Him in whom all virtues meet. What single moral excellence can be named of which He was not a type ?

Now of this unparalleled phenomenon we call on our opponents to give some account. Great is the miracle of Christ's works ; still greater is the miracle of His teaching ; but the miracle of His Life is greatest of all. His enemies cannot deny it : **CAN THEY ACCOUNT FOR IT ?**

Jesus of Nazareth has become—as even they who do not believe in Him allow—"the great turning point in the world's history."³ And is it regarding Him that the advancing science, the erudite scepticism of our day has to confess that it knows not what to make of what He was, or what He said, or what

³ Hörler "On Faith and Knowledge in Religion." p. 46.

He did? Is it before Him that it must "silently stand as before an eternal problem?"⁴ This hopeless confusion, this helpless impotence, is surely a pitiful and ignominious result for an electicism which superciliously affects to do without the Bible!

Not such the attitude of those who know in whom they have believed. Not so have they learned Christ. They know that "in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." In His incomparable glory they recognise "the glory as of the Only Begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." In the incarnation, the life and death of the Saviour of men, they perceive the distinguishing glory of Christianity—the design to reveal to all mankind "**THE GLORY OF GOD IN THE FACE OF JESUS CHRIST.**"

I call this "the distinguishing glory of Christianity."

For "God is a Spirit :" where He acts, there only can we see Him. He is the omnipresent Power, the inconceivable Goodness, which we can never see, and never know, except so far as He shall manifest himself by his doings. Does He desire to impress us with the idea of His power? Then He launches His lightnings across the heavens, or shakes the continents by His unseen hand. Then

"Far along
From peak to peak, the rattling crags among,
Leaps the live thunder!"

Does He wish to beam upon us in love? What can be more expressive than the summer sunset, with the thousand nameless tints and hues which gives its expression of peace and happiness to the landscape,

"When day with farewell beam delays
Among the opening clouds of even,
And we can almost think we gaze
Through golden vistas into heaven?"

If He would make us acquainted with His benevolence and skill, He contrives some mechanism which exhibits them. He constructs an eye or a hand, so filled with ingenious con-

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 47.

trivances for our benefit that we may be centuries in exploring their mysterious wonders, and yet not learn them all. How can He give us some conception of His Infinite Understanding? He can plan the motions of the planets, and so exactly balance their opposing forces, that thousands of years shall not accumulate the slightest error, or disturb the unchanging precision of their way. But the great question is yet to come. How can such a Being exhibit the moral principle by which His mighty energies are all controlled? How shall he exhibit to us the moral beauty of justice, and benevolence, and mercy, between man and man? How shall He convince us of His desire that suffering should be mitigated, and injuries forgiven, and universal peace and good-will reign among the members of the great human family? Can He do this by the earthquake or the thunder, by the loveliness of the evening landscape, or the magnificence of countless suns and stars? No. He might declare His moral attributes as He might have declared His power; but if He would bring home to us the one, as vividly and distinctly as the other, He must use the same means; we must see Him (where only we can see Him) in action; He must act out His moral principles by a moral manifestation, in a moral scene; and *the great beauty of Christianity is, that it represents Him as doing so.* "No man hath seen God at any time: The Only Begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, HE hath declared Him."

He brings out the purity, and spotlessness, and moral glory of the Divinity, through the workings of a human mind, called into existence for this purpose, and stationed in a most conspicuous attitude among men. In the movements of a planet, the energy of the Deity shews us such powers and principles as majestic motion can shew; and in the moral movements of a mind in which the energies of Deity equally mingle, and which they equally guide, we have the far more important manifestation which the movements of thought and feeling can shew." "Without some direct manifestation of the Deity in the spiritual world, the display of His character would be fatally incomplete; and it is a beautiful illustration of the more than harmony which exists between nature and revelation, that the latter does thus, in precise analogy, exactly complete what the former had

begun.”⁵ Thus the moral perfections of Divinity are exhibited to us in the only way by which (so far as we can see) it is possible directly to shew them; by coming out in action, in the very field of human duty, by a mysterious union with a human intellect and human powers. The moral phenomenon displayed before the world in the Person of Jesus Christ is no longer a dark enigma: it is “**GOD MANIFEST IN THE FLESH;**” the visible moral embodiment of an all-pervading moral Deity, Himself for ever invisible.

Nor is this all. Jesus Christ stands forth before the world not more to be admired and revered than to be imitated. He is “**The Light of the world;**” not more as its Great Teacher than as its Great Exemplar. He appears not only as The Perfect Man, but as The Perfect Model for all mankind. In that He was “**holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners;**” He has shown us the “**beauty of holiness;**” in “**leaving us an example, that we should tread in His steps;**” He has shown us how the servant may be “**as his Master;**” and the disciple as his Lord. In the one we have the peculiar glory, and in the other the peculiar perfectness, of that Religion which He came to illustrate and to teach.

It is a principle universally recognised, that to give theory without practice, or precept without example, is but labour lost. If therefore even He who is almighty designed to give a perfect and final system of instruction to mankind, it could be done only by placing in their midst a perfect human nature; a Being who would not only give perfect precepts, but also a complete and perfect practical illustration of them. The conduct of an angel, however perfect, would not be (for us) exemplary. Man must see the discharge of his duties, as man, exemplified in his own nature. Human nature can be perfected in no other way than by the imitation of a perfect model of human nature. But with the perfect rule of duty in his hand, and a perfect model character before him, man possesses a system of instruction perfectly adapted to his nature, and adapted to perfect his nature.

That perfect model character is Jesus Christ. He came from

⁵ See Abbott’s “**Corner Stone,**” ch. i.

heaven to earth, that the tabernacle of God might be with men. He assumed human nature, that He might be “able to have compassion on them that are ignorant and them that are out of the way.” He expounded and illustrated the Divine Law in human language; showed its spiritual import, and applied it to the different circumstances and conditions of human life. He cleared it of those false glosses of ignorance and prejudice by which its lustre had been dimmed. He modified or rescinded those permissions which were accommodated to the darkness of former times, and the imperfections of the Jewish system; and then by applications the most striking and definite, he shewed the bearing of this perfect rule of duty upon all the varieties of human action.

He did more than all this. For while He thus defined and applied the absolutely perfect Moral Law, His whole life was a continual illustration of its unrivalled excellence. He conformed Himself to all its requirements. He fulfilled all righteousness. He magnified the Law, and made it honourable. Whether adding to the gladness of the marriage feast, or mitigating the sorrow of the bereaved; whether borne along on the high-tide of popularity, or forsaken by His last friend; He is still our pattern, still The Perfect Man! Thus, in all places and under all circumstances, wherever any of earth’s children are called to act, Jesus, the model Man, is seen living and moving before them—in the world, but “not of the world”—and His voice falls upon their ear, not more with the cadence of authority than of encouragement—“FOLLOW ME!”⁶

From this explanation of the fact however, we revert to the fact itself. We ask our opponents for some account of it. They are philosophers (!), they will therefore not deny that so august an Effect must have an adequate Cause. The Scriptural account of the matter is natural, consistent, and complete. Theirs must not be less so. But accounted for or not, the fact remains. In Jesus Christ we see a mind never allured by folly, or deranged by passion, or impeded by sloth. We see a physical frame which no guilty indulgence had impaired, and a countenance bright with its expression of intelligence and

⁶ See “Philosophy of Salvation,” ch. x. p. 77.

energy, yet beaming with kindness and love. We see the perfection of human nature ; the carrying out of all that God originally intended in the creation of man. But why ? How is it that among the millions upon millions of mankind, this has been the only spotless One ? How is it that He alone has walked in purity, never sinned, never sought selfishly His own, never given unnecessary pain, never done an injury, or uttered an impatient word, or struck a blow in anger, or harboured a feeling of revenge ? He stands before the world a glorious monument of perfect virtue ; the more glorious as it is solitary. No other nation, or kindred, or people, or clime, ever furnished such a case, or pretended to furnish one. Among the endless fables of ancient, or the proud pretensions of modern times, no historian, or mythologist, no priest, prophet, or philosopher, has ever pretended to find a spotless man. The whole world withdraws its pretensions. Every system of religion, and every school of philosophy stand back from this field, and leave Jesus Christ alone, the solitary example of perfect moral purity, in the midst of a world lying in sin.

In this great cardinal fact alone we have irrefragable proof of the Truth of Christianity. We need nothing more to make it indubitably certain that Jesus Christ is “a Teacher come from God :” and that “GOD . . . HATH in these last days SPOKEN UNTO US BY HIS SON.”

CHAPTER XIV.

IT IS CERTAIN: THAT THE TESTIMONY OF CHRIST TO THE
TRUTH OF CHRISTIANITY RECEIVES IRRESISTIBLE FORCE
FROM THE PERFECTION OF HIS CHARACTER.

“If God has not spoken and acted through CHRIST, then there never has been a God who hath acted and spoken.”—LAVATER.

LET us now inquire—What does history inform us that Christ said for Himself?

In the fourth, third, and second centuries of our era, we find the adversaries of Christianity (Julian, Porphyry, Celsus,) all referring to Christ as having *professed* Himself able to work miracles. They endeavoured to represent these miracles as an exhibition of magical arts; but they never thought of doubting that Christ *said* He was endowed with miraculous power.

The Talmudical literature, commencing in the second century, also gives prominence to Christ's alleged miracles. The later Jews, according to the account of Mr. Baden Powell himself, adopted the account of one of their own writers, in which Christ's miracles are described substantially as they are now found in the Gospels.

Here then we have one clearly indubitable fact. The portrait of Christ, as projected on the mirror of profane history, is the portrait of a professed worker of miracles.

But the well known (subjoined) passage from Tacitus presents us with most important information of a still earlier date.¹ The

¹ “But neither these exertions, nor his largesses to the people, nor his offerings to the gods, did away with the infamous imputation under which Nero lay, of having ordered the city to be set on

historical character of this passage is undisputed. "The most sceptical criticism," says Gibbon, whose authority in such a case is absolutely conclusive, "is obliged to respect the integrity of this celebrated passage of Tacitus." This testimony of Tacitus then puts these facts beyond doubt:—

That a religious sect which had originated in remote Judæa, a land held in contempt and detestation throughout the civilised world of antiquity, had become in Nero's time a "vast multitude" in the city of Rome. That this sect took the name of Christ: They were Christians. That the Christians retained their designation, and adhered to Christ, in the midst of intense and inhuman hatred. So obnoxious were they to the inhabitants of Rome, that it was advantageous to Nero to put them to death, on an accusation notoriously false, in a manner diabolically cruel. It must therefore be concluded that The Person, named Christ, after whom these Christians called themselves, had

fire. To put an end, therefore, to this report, he laid the guilt, and inflicted the most cruel punishments upon a set of men, hated for their wickedness, who were commonly called Christians. The author of that sect was Christ, who, in the reign of Tiberius, suffered death by sentence of the procurator, Pontius Pilate. This pernicious superstition, thus checked for a time, again broke out, not only in Judæa, the nest of the mischief, but in the city also, whither all atrocious and scandalous things flow, and where all flourish. At first, those only were apprehended, who confessed themselves of that sect; afterwards a vast multitude discovered by them, all of whom were condemned, not so much for the crime of burning the city, as for their enmity to mankind. Their executions were so contrived as to ex-

pose them to derision and contempt. Some were covered with the skins of wild beasts, that they might be torn to pieces; some were crucified; while others having been daubed over with combustible materials were set up as lights in the night time, and thus burnt to death. For these spectacles Nero gave his own gardens, and, at the same time, exhibited there the diversions of the circus, sometimes standing in the crowd as a spectator, in the habit of a charioteer, and at other times driving a chariot himself, until at length these men, though really criminal, and deserving exemplary punishment, began to be commiserated, as people who were destroyed, not out of regard to the public welfare, but only to gratify the cruelty of one man." (Tacit. *Annal.* xv. 44.)

stamped upon them His influence with tremendous potency and vivid distinctness.

Now this Person—for whose sake this “vast multitude” endured contempt, detestation, ferocious cruelty—the Person whose influence had extended, not through a district or a parish, but from the remotest outskirt of Rome’s dominion to the capital of the empire—had been dead considerably less than forty years. And as the sect took His name, found in His name their definite and comprehensive characterization, and shrank from no suffering for His sake, it is absolutely certain that they would seek to know as much of Him as possible, and would do their best to retain the memory of His words and sayings.

What advantages had they for attaining this object? Let the answer be solemnly and earnestly weighed. Every man who had passed the age of thirty-five when Nero was putting to death that “vast multitude” of Christians, *had been a contemporary of Christ*. This, too, in an age when memory was in all its freshness, and when thirty-five years stood for a far shorter period in the chronology of mind than in our hurrying, excited, changeful days. The Jews, too, were a wandering people: and it is not difficult to conceive of causes urging men who had mingled in Christ’s audiences to quit Judæa. It is therefore in the highest degree improbable that there were not among the Christians of Rome to whom in Nero’s time Christ was dearer than life, some, if not many, who had seen and heard Him. But the fact that a vast multitude believed in Christ, in Rome, in Nero’s time, demonstrates that multitudes believed on Him also in other parts of the empire; and the intensity of Christian faith in Rome would be more than a fair test of its intensity in other places, including Judæa. In brief, the words and deeds of Christ were of infinite concern to multitudes in the land of His activity, and in the centre of the intelligence of the world, while millions of His contemporaries were alive. It was a serious matter for a Christian in the time of Nero to have made a mistake about Christ. Unless the crucified “malefactor” was what Christians at this day believe Him to have been, death by burning in the form of a torch at a public game would have been a terrific misfortune. Man’s sovereign passion, the passion for truth, would in such

circumstances come into play. What Christ *said* and *did* would be of more practical and earnest interest than a pretty or pathetic tale concerning Him. And if the Christian who was to seal his profession in a death of studied torments, preferred truth touching Christ to fancy, there were thousands, there were hundreds of thousands, of Christ's cotemporaries alive to whom reference might be made.

Turning now from Tacitus to those Christians of whom he speaks, we find, at the earliest period when their own voice becomes audible in history, that they have four records of the life of Christ to which they attach supreme importance. These are the Evangelical narratives we now possess. They are referred to by the early Christians, as containing in pure and authentic form what they knew of Christ. They are collections of sayings, discourses, and occurrences, which could not have been heard and seen without leaving a vivid impression on the memory ; and they are preserved with the amber-like clearness and crystalline decision with which the mind in an unreading age retains intense impressions. “Christ committed nothing to manuscript, but those parables, radiant with beauty, those thoughts penetrating to the heart’s heart of every subject, those flashes of moral insight which light up the soul’s inmost caverns with the candle of God, were an ineffaceable writing traced upon the memory of His generation. In Evangelist after Evangelist those things recur. There is just enough of diversity to obviate all idea of collusion ; there is that manifest identity which proves the impression, though made on many minds, to have been so well marked and profound, that any play of imagination about its keen edges was impossible.”² In a word, there is that which—apart from the incidental corroboration furnished by Tacitus, Josephus, and others,—is amply sufficient to convince any reasonable mind that the words and acts of Christ, imprinted on the evangelical narratives, are irrefragably historical.

² P. Bayne: from whose masterly work, “The Testimony of Christ to Christianity,” the argu- ment of this chapter has been, for the most part, freely condensed.

What, then, is Christ's testimony to His own religion ? What is the proof He offers that it is Divine ?

We have its compendious statement in His own words. John Baptist had been thrown into prison. Naturally perplexed at such an interruption of his ministry, and probably expecting some intervention of Jesus on his behalf, he sent messengers to Christ to ask, point-blank, whether He was the Messiah or not. "Jesus answered and said unto them, Go and shew John again those things which ye do hear and see : The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them. And blessed is he, whosoever shall not be offended in me." These words are distinct and explicit. They are related with close coincidence by Matthew and Luke ; the occurrence which called them forth is one likely to have happened ; they exactly suit its circumstances ; and they are such as could not fail to have impressed themselves on the minds of the hearers. We may be as sure of their having been uttered by Christ as if our own ears had heard them.

In the evidence here adduced by Christ himself that He was the Messiah of God, two things are broadly discriminated : first, possession of miraculous power ; second, proclamation of good tidings to the poor. In other words, Christ claimed Divine authority, because armed with Divine power, and preaching a gospel of Divine mercy and holiness.

It is with the first of these two that our present argument is chiefly concerned ; yet its relation to the second ought never to be overlooked. The truth concerning Christ's miracles, as taught practically in deed, and expressly in word, by Himself, is not to be clearly and fully apprehended at a first hasty glance. It is a truth whose line is traced with Divine precision by the finger of the Saviour between the falsehood of two opposing extremes : that of the power-worshippers, on the one hand, and that of the power-despisers, on the other ; that of those who view miracles as the sole attestation of a Divine mission, and that of those who extenuate their evidential force, and pronounce them mere teaching by example.

It is certain, first of all, that Christ never spoke of miraculous power as a mechanical, sensible test, by which He was prepared to *extort* belief in His mission. The devil asked Him to perform a miracle in proof of His divinity ; the Jews demanded a sign that He was the Son of God : in both cases He refused compliance. “An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign, and there shall no sign be given it.” “Except ye see signs and wonders ye will not believe.”

It is, in the second place, equally certain, that Christ expressly, deliberately, consciously asserted His possession of miraculous power. This fact is equally important and undeniable. Miracles are no brilliant embroidery wrought on the plain web of the evangelical narrative : they pervade it, warp and woof. There is miracle at Christ's birth and at His baptism ; His ministry is replete with miracle ; it is amid the sublime terrors of miracle that He dies : and He rises miraculously into the sky when returning to heaven. From His own lips we have the declaration that He raised the dead : and if anything is known of Christ at all, it is known that He broadly and distinctly *asserted* His possession of miraculous power.

In the third place, it is beyond question that Christ attached a *strictly* evidential character to His miraculous works. The sceptre of God's creative power is not so holy or so august as the word of His mouth ; but it is sacred and august, and it can be borne only in the hand to which God commits it. Christ referred to His mighty works as aggravating the guilt of the cities which rejected, and the men who reviled Him. He did more. He solemnly declared those works to be God's testimony in His behalf : “My Father which sent Me, He doeth the works.”

Now, every hypothesis that Christ was not the Messiah sent from God, must admit of being classed under one of three heads ;—imposture, delusion, or a mixture of the two. Sceptics have put their ingenuity to the utmost strain to invest these various and conflicting hypotheses with some show of plausibility ; but the gist of all such theories comes to this—that Christ was a singular type of the moral enthusiast ; that He deceived Himself as well as others ; that, when consciously deceitful, the fraud was pious ; and that, after all deductions are

made on account of what his age, nation, and circumstances led him into, he will remain worthy of respect and admiration.

In examining the validity of these suppositions, it is to be observed that the third has no place whatever, independent of the other two. It is as to the existence of these two therefore that our inquiry must be directed. There can be no blending of both if either is wanting. *Was Christ of weak mind?* *Was He capable of falsehood?* Was He capable of deceiving, or of being deceived? These two are the only suppositions possible to those who reject His testimony. Is there, for either of them, any foundation in fact?

I. WAS CHRIST'S TESTIMONY MISTAKEN?

1. It is freely granted that the influence of religious enthusiasm is strange and subtle, and that most religious *impostors* have been self-deceived. But on the other hand it is a notable fact that honest and manly characters, though inflamed in the highest degree with religious enthusiasm, have *not* been betrayed into the fancy that they possessed miraculous power. Mohammed, in a barbarous age, among a barbarous people, was a most vehement enthusiast; but he was never deluded into the belief that he could work miracles. He expressly declared that he could not.³ Edward Irving was a most remarkable enthusiast. He believed implicitly in the visions and revelations of the enthusiasts by whom he was surrounded. But he was an upright man. Even in his aberrations he was a powerfully-minded man. The result was that, while wondering that privileges were not vouchsafed to him similar to those of the persons in whom he believed, he never imagined that he was supernaturally gifted or visited. Was Christ's enthusiasm, then, so uncontrollable, or His intellectual faculty so weak, that he was beguiled into delusions from which common sense guarded Mohammed and Edward Irving? Was His mind so strangely clouded, so hotly imaginative, that He believed Him-

E. g., "Signs are in the power of God alone, and I am no more than a public preacher." (Sale's Koran, c. xxix. p. 328.) Paley

has noted fifteen other places in which, with more or less explicitness, Mohammed makes the same admission. (Evid. ch. ix. sect. iii.)

self—not to have seen a vision or heard a voice, not to have healed one or two sick persons or calmed one or two maniacs, but—to have cured blindness, deafness, lameness, leprosy, for years, by word or touch ; to have walked on the sea ; to have fed large multitudes with a few loaves and fishes ; to have dried up a tree with His rebuke ; to have, on several occasions, recalled the dead to life ? The answer is, that the Christ who laid claim to all this possessed the most clear, balanced, serene, and comprehensive intellect known to history.

2. The temperament of Christ was of the kind specially opposed to enthusiasm. Personally pure and passionless, his soul was celestially free from sensual taint ; and His religion is, accordingly, the least sensual of all religions. But this very purity—this heaven-like spirituality of mind—lays one open to another danger, the danger of asceticism. It is a danger so subtle and so potent, that no religious development known among men has escaped *both* the sensual snare and the ascetic. Between these false extremes, all earth-born religions, and all corrupt forms of the Divine religion, have oscillated. But Christ was no more an ascetic than a sensualist. He set His brand upon polygamy, but gave no encouragement to celibacy. His manner of life was broadly and healthily human. He partook of the natural enjoyments of others. He provided wine for a marriage feast. He sympathized with music and dancing to welcome back prodigals. He provoked the sneer of His enemies that He “came eating and drinking.” It was a robust virtue that He taught, a virtue with foot firmly planted on the earth, a virtue arrayed in battle harness and stained with battle dust. Things appeared to Him in their true relations, through the clear eye of sense.

This is of all dispositions the least liable to delusion. The coincidence of such a disposition, with the imagination of possessing power to raise the dead and to create food for multitudes, would be a more singular effect than the creation of a world. The human mind absolutely fails to conceive it. Jesus Christ was no shrieking fanatic, no dreaming visionary ; His yea was yea, His nay, nay ; His every perception was steady, clear, and calm. When He told the messengers of John that

He raised the dead, He knew what He was saying, as well as the most scientific head of the nineteenth century.

3. Remark, next, with what lofty and comprehensive discernment Christ rose above the erroneous ideas formed by His own disciples of His kingdom and His work. That kingdom, He said, came not with observation. It was to penetrate the mass of the world like leaven ; it was to grow silently, gradually, as a tree ; it was to use no weapon taken from the armouries of earth. "No man who has devoted any attention to psychological or biographical inquiries can fail to perceive that this conception, formed in an age like that in which Christ appeared, involved an exhibition of *intellectual* power unexampled in history. It is sublime—infinitely sublime. This Jewish peasant, wandering with a few poor mechanics about the inland seas and bordering wildernesses of Judæa, homeless as the bird of the air, and the fox of the hill, His meagre retinue forced sometimes to appease their hunger by rubbing out the ears of corn, rises to an apprehension of moral and spiritual power transcending infinitely that of the rulers, the priests, the teachers of His nation, and of all the sages and philosophers of His time. This Jewish peasant looks upon the glories of antiquity, upon the mighty edifice of ancient civilization, and is placidly, immovably assured that the words of truth spoken by His mouth in remote Palestine will smite its pinnacles with the fire of God, and strike down its cloud-capped towers, and of all the fabric of its vision leave not a wreck behind." *

4. Then again, the Christ of the Gospels is eminently shrewd and cool-minded. The halo of moral light which surrounds Him obscures to us the robustness, the sharp-cutting vigour, the solidity, the acuteness, the adroitness, of His purely human understanding. His Gospel was the Gospel of love, but He was not in the least sentimental :—witness the parables of the talents, the vineyard labourers, and the unjust steward.

5. Observe also, with what a fine, keen, discrimination He deals with different minds. Christ's mode of treating diversities of character is a complete psychological study. The

* Bayne.

deepest root of motive is as clear to Him as the topmost flower of action. Those who believe that He was the Son of God, and that he had a supernatural insight into the heart, may see little wonderful in His "knowing what was *in* men." But those who believe that He was a moralizing doctor, bewildered into a notion that His cures were miraculous, are bound to account for His perspicacity on the hypothesis that He was deluded in the matter of His supernatural power.

6. Another series of illustrations of the calm perspicacity of the intellect of Christ, is afforded by His answers to those who approached Him with false and insidious questions. But perhaps the most rare, and so to speak, original quality of the Saviour's intellect is its many-sidedness; the habit and capacity of seeing a fact or a truth on every side and in every light. No condemnation so stern as His for the ostentation of the hypocrite; but He forgets not that though villainy may take the mask of virtue, virtue must still wear her frank smile and open brow, and commands His disciples to "let their light shine before men." He enjoins the wisdom of the serpent; He has no regard for devout maundering and pious ineptitude: but the wisdom He enjoins must be combined with the harmlessness of the dove. He denounces the substitution of scrupulous exactness in paying tithe of mint and anise and cummin, for the weightier matters of the law, justice, mercy, and faith: but He leaves no opening for the idea that tender conscientiousness is to be despised: "These ought ye to have done, and not to have left the other undone." In a word, His eye embraces the balancings of the clouds and the courses of the heavens; yet it sees also the shadow cast by the daisy on the stone.

7. One other characteristic of Christ, not to be classed exclusively with either the intellectual or moral powers, but tempering and beautifying both, was His habit of dwelling affectionately on the aspects of nature. It may fairly be doubted whether any man retaining the child-love for green fields and morning flowers, has ever been consciously and inveterately bad. But in its noble form this love of nature is eminently a trait of Christian times. Paganism did not tone the mind finely enough for sympathy with nature's poetry.

"I do not know," says Mr. Ruskin, "that of the expressions of affection towards external nature to be found among heathen writers, there are any of which the leading thought leans not towards the sensual parts of her. Her beneficence they sought, and her power they shunned ; her teaching they understood never." For a Christian man, on the other hand, "it is not possible," says the same great writer, "to walk across so much as a rood of the natural earth, with mind unagitated and rightly poised, without receiving strength and hope from some stone, flower, leaf, or sound, nor without a sense of a dew falling upon him out of the sky."

Now, the Person who introduced this finer influence into life, this gentler music into civilization, was Jesus Christ. He it was who exalted our whole conceptions of nature by habitually associating it with the spiritual instruction of man. He made the wind God's minister to raise the mind of Nicodemus to a conception of the Spirit's influence ; He quickened the Christian energies of His disciples by pointing to the fields whitening to harvest ; He marked the fluttering wings over the stony uplands round the Galilean lake, and drew a warning for the frivolous and the fickle in all ages from the devouring of the seed by the birds, and the withering of the shallow-rooted corn. Yet while nature, in its beauty and hallowed suggestiveness, was ever present with Christ, He shewed no trace of the ecstasy of mere indolent contemplation. He never paused to lay on the colours of the scene painter. Nature He viewed as made for man ; her illuminated lettering He used to impress upon man the lessons of Divine wisdom ; the lilies of the field were to be *considered*, in their monitions to humility, in their lessons of trust in God, in their gentle yet most expressive satire on regal glory and gorgeous apparel.

All this attests a state of perfect mental health, a settled calm of power and peace, a still and placid elevation of soul, infinitely beyond reach of any cloud or any wind by which the clearness of the intellectual eye might be dimmed or its calmness, in the slightest degree, disturbed.

II. WAS CHRIST'S TESTIMONY FALSE ?

To this question there can be but one answer : The thing is

impossible! Nothing in the world is more certain than that Christ "did no sin ; neither was guile found in His mouth." To the facts adduced in the preceding chapter however, I shall here add no more than a single observation specially worthy the attention of our opponents.

Christ's entire conception of His Messiahship is that of a moral and spiritual, not a material work. The Deliverer expected by His age and country was one who should be like the old deliverers, a man of war. They looked for a conquering Messiah, crested with victory, to bow down the necks of their enemies. They thought His miraculous power would be used to smite down opposing hosts. They were perplexed to see Him working miracles, and yet refusing to be made a king. But HE—through the innumerable obstructions and obscurations of the time—penetrated to the central and eternal truth, that healing for a nation can only be of the soul, the conscience, the character. He rested everything upon *moral* renovation. The Sermon on the Mount, indubitably historical, places this for ever beyond doubt. Take away the moral element of Christ's teaching, and what remains? The whole has vanished. False religions turn entirely on ceremonies and performances ; His was spirit and truth—and nothing else. "*Can we conceive a teacher whose doctrine was thus profoundly and persuasively moral, binding it up with a falsehood?*" The Jews looked for signs and wonders : true ; but Christ confronted prejudices and prepossessions of the nation every whit as powerful as this, and why should He give way here alone?" Miracles increased the power of His preaching : doubtless ; but He could refuse to gratify the vague longing to see a sign. If ever there was a teacher who would have dispensed with miracles unless they were true, that teacher was Jesus Christ.

And yet this Jesus, who defines the devil as "a liar," who has the clearest consciousness that a lie is the very essence of evil, tells the Jews that God the Father witnesses for Him ; the form of that witness being the mighty works done by Him.

"Were those mighty works a deception? Did the words in which Christ searched into motive and pierced the subtlest hypocrisy go like daggers through His own heart? That is the question. There is no evading it. History has heard of no

Christ who was not a miracle-worker. Jews and disciples, Christians and infidels, Matthew and Luke, Celsus and Julian, all know Christ as one who constantly, and for years, declared Himself able to raise the dead. Can human conception embrace the very thought that He was lying? No! The conscience and the intellect of the race start back appalled at the imagination of a miracle so stupendous. The crushing of all the stars into powder in one grasp of God's hand would not be such a miracle."

Besides all this, we have the attestation of Christ's truthfulness furnished by His death. His crucifixion was an infinitely solemn ratification of all He had asserted. "It is impossible to read the narrative of the Saviour's trial, and to observe the calmness and clearness of His answers, without feeling that every occurrence of His ministry must have then lain under the perspicuous glance of His recollection. At that moment, He must have been distinctly conscious that He had professed to raise the dead, to still the tempest, to create food for multitudes, to open the eyes of those born blind. In the glare of confronting death, how completely would He have felt every plausible sophistry of pious fraud, every fond delusion of imagined power, to be shrivelled up! But He never faltered. He was what He had declared Himself to be from the beginning. When He was weak as a lamb in the hands of its destroyer, when the arm of His Father was restrained, when no angel-hand was present to wipe His blood-stained brow, His faith that he had bid the winds be still, and the dead start up alive, was as firm as when the multitudes cast their garments in His way, and hailed Him as the King of Israel, coming in the name of the Lord. That is a fact—a plain historical fact. Four witnesses attest this attitude of Christ before his accusers, and the wildest credulity of scepticism must shrink from the idea that four men have existed in this world who could have drawn four such pictures as that of Christ in His trial and crucifixion, if there had been no original for the portrait, no actuality for the occurrence. And if Christ died as the Evangelists represent Him as dying, can words be found strong enough to express the confirmation thus afforded to all He had previously declared?"

III. This then is our case: and our opponents have utterly failed to meet it. Christ was no deceiver; His works showed Him to be "God that cannot lie:" and we have it on His own words, that He raised the dead. We call on our opponents—on their own principles—to account for the facts which they themselves admit. Fichte, the noblest representative of recent pantheistic speculation in Germany, a man of superb intellectual vigour, and impassioned devotion to truth and purity, bore Christ the highest testimony which it is possible for a German metaphysician to bear to any one. Jesus Christ, according to Fichte, was carried by the mere purity and elevation of His character into that region of transcendental and eternal morality, to which a few other minds have risen only after long philosophic study and musing. He, a Jewish peasant, did more than all the philosophers in bringing heavenly morality into the hearts and homes of common men. The philosophers had sects and coteries; His followers were nations and generations. Yet Fichte never confronted the question, How this Jesus, whose stainless moral character made Him the representative of purified humanity, could have falsely asserted that He had raised the dead, and fed five thousand on some morsels of bread and fish?

Goethe was the universal genius of modern Germany, and is believed by many to have been the greatest man who has appeared in Europe for several centuries. He calls Christ "the Divine man," and represents Him as the pattern, example, and model of humanity. No thinker of the first order, since Goethe, has dissented from his estimate of Christ's moral character. Mr. Carlyle, his great follower in this country, has always referred to it in terms of profound reverence. The life of the Saviour is, in his view, a "perfect ideal Poem." "The greatest of all heroes," he says, "is One whom we do not name here!" He invariably mentions Christ as One who stood so far above common humanity, that common men might not unnaturally bow down to worship Him; yet when we press for an answer to the question how this ideal Man got mixed up with such "incredibilities" as feeding five thousand on a few loaves and fishes, walking on the sea, raising the dead,—when we exclaim that the imputa-

tion to Him of honesty only darkens the enigma of His character if He was not what His disciples believed Him,—Mr. Carlyle is dumb.

And no wonder. His very silence is more eloquent than M. Renan's speech. For what is Renan's own theory? Even he cannot withstand the conviction that Jesus is the perfect model of humanity. He pronounces over Him this apotheosis: "Repose now in Thy glory, noble initiator. Thy work is achieved; Thy divinity is established. . . . Between Thee and God distinctions shall be made no more." But this Divine Being, the Being who is inseparable from God Himself, professed to work miracles. And the exigencies of Renan's hypothesis inexorably demand that miracles should be branded as impostures. What then is to be done? How will the critic evade the dilemma of his own creation? He cannot evade it, except by consenting to accuse his paragon of artifice, and to bring in "the model Man" guilty of imposture! Why even Mr. Newman's theory, astounding and shocking as it is, inconceivable and incredible to every one but himself, is at all events more consistent than this. Yet this most monstrous doctrine is the very best that can be propounded by the most ingenious and eloquent of sceptics! "A false Messiah is proclaimed to be the Elect of God, in whom His soul delighteth. The highest Throne of Heaven is in league with iniquity: and the casting out of Satan by Satan becomes the Divine programme of the universe. A more hopeless chaos than the character of Renan's imaginary Christ no artist ever mistook for a creation."⁵ "We have read," says an able writer on this subject, "We have read every word of M. Renan's book: we have weighed it as impartially, as we should think, any thorough believer can weigh it; and our deliberate judgment is, that as a defence of scepticism, in spite of its freshness and cleverness, it is an *utter failure*. He cannot show how it is that the Gospels can be worthy of implicit credit in all parts where they *do not* testify to the supernatural, but that where they *do* they are puerile and wholly false. He cannot show how Jesus could be a wise

⁵ See the admirable "Charge" | his Second Visitation: June 30, of The Ven. Archdeacon Prest, at | 1864.

and kind man, worthy of the honour of all mankind, if he were not the Christ of God.”⁶

The truth is, that after nearly two thousand years, those who refuse to have Christ for their King have not succeeded in explaining the enigma of His life. Not only are they not *agreed* as to the explanation of this enigma ; but against the Christian explanation of the life and character of Christ there is no infidel theory, to the very principle and essence of which infidels profess agreement. The infidel theories of the last century have been dust under the feet of infidels in the present. It may be doubted whether any sceptical theory has held undisputed sway among unbelievers in Christianity for ten years. Theory after theory has emerged ; theory after theory has been greeted with exultant welcome by men who had made up their minds to reject Christ ; and theory after theory, fluttering aloft for a brief space, like a moth in the wind, has been borne away for ever. What Isaac Taylor said a year or two ago is still strictly true :—“There is not, so far as I know, at this time afloat any accepted and available non-Christian solution of the enigma regarding the origin of Christianity ; non-belief at this moment has come to a stand-still.” The heart of the enigma lies in the life and character of Christ. And the problem presented by that life and character, infidelity has utterly failed to solve.

Still, the great fact remains. The only Christ known to history, broadly, constantly, deliberately, asserted His power to heal the sick, cure the blind, raise the dead. If He did not say that He possessed this power, we may shut up the volume of history, since it can certify *no* fact ; if He said it, can we imagine Him to have said it falsely ? If He said it truly, was He not, and *is* He not, the Son of God ?

In conclusion, we may commend to our adversaries' consideration their own admissions. “The history of Jesus Christ,” says Rousseau, “has marks of truth so palpable, so striking, and so perfectly inimitable, that its inventor would excite our admiration more than its hero.” To the same purpose, though still more forcible, is the testimony of Theodore Parker :—“ We

⁶ Christian Observer, vol. lxii. p. 781.

can learn but few facts about Jesus. But measure Him by the shadow He has cast into the world, and by the light He has shed upon it, and shall we be told, that such a man never lived—that the whole story is a lie? Suppose that Plato and Newton never lived; that their story is a lie; but who did their works, and thought their thoughts? It takes a Newton to forge a Newton. What man could have fabricated a Jesus? None but a Jesus."

CHAPTER XV.

IT IS CERTAIN: THAT THE OLD ARGUMENTS IN PROOF OF
THE TRUTH OF CHRISTIANITY ARE NOT ANTIQUATED.
THEY STILL REMAIN UNANSWERED.

"The Bible emptied, effete, worn out! If all the wisest men of the world were placed man to man, they could not sound the shallowest depth of the Gospel of John. O philosophers! break the shell, and fly out, and let me hear how you can sing. Not of passion—I know that already; not of worldly power—I hear that everywhere; but teach me through your song, how to find joy in sorrow, strength in weakness, and light in darkest days; how to bear buffeting and scorn, how to welcome death, and to pass through its ministration into the sphere of life; and this, not for me only, but for the whole world that groans and travails in pain; and until you can do this, speak not to me of a better revelation."—HENRY WARD BEECHER.

BRUNO BAUER, in his vain attempt to evade the Difficulties of Unbelief, has recently returned to the long exploded hypothesis which ascribes the Gospels to deliberate fabrication. Bishop Colenso tells us that the Pentateuch is not the work of Moses; and that the book of Deuteronomy, at all events, is a forgery of the time of Jeremiah. These facts prove but too conclusively that, in the estimation of these gentlemen and their adherents, the Bible is as completely destitute of an Inspiration specially supernatural and divine, as "any other book." Be it so. Our account of the matter is that "all Scripture" was written by "holy men of God" who were specially and supernaturally "moved by the Holy Ghost" for this very purpose. Our opponents, on the contrary, affirm that there is no supernaturalism in the case, but that Scripture, equally with "any other book," came "by the will of man." On our view it is essentially divine: on theirs it is entirely human. Suppose we abandon our own view, and adopt theirs: what then? Then the writers are reduced to the level of other

writers: they are merely ordinary men. But were they bad, or good men? To the argument we are now pursuing it is immaterial: but it is evident that they were either one or the other. But what follows? Take the first supposition:—

I. Were the writers of the Bible bad men?

1. The idea is inconceivable. For like produces like. “An evil man out of the treasure of his heart produces evil things.” But the excellence of the Bible is admitted on all hands as being beyond all comparison. It supplies the most perfect Rule of Duty. It furnishes the most illustrious examples of Moral Excellence. Its precepts cover the entire field of human obligation. Its motives are at once the purest and the strongest conceivable. “Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report;” these are its themes from first to last. To suppose that the men who chose these themes were bad men, is it to suppose that “men gather grapes of thorns and figs of thistles!” For how—in the moral world, any more than in the natural—can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit? It is therefore certain that bad men could not have written these things, if they would. And when we further observe the severity of the condemnation which they uniformly pass upon everything unholy, we feel it to be equally certain that they would not thus have passed sentence upon themselves, even if they could. The Writers of the Bible were therefore not bad men.

2. They were therefore good men.

But being good men, they were true. Nothing can be more express or more emphatic than their “putting away lying,” their “renouncing the hidden things of dishonesty.” With them a lie is the very essence of evil; the Devil “is a liar:” and their highest commendation is reserved for the man “in whom is no guile.” Yet these good men, with whom truth is the first of all cardinal virtues—whose God is a “God that cannot lie,” whose great attainment is “Truth in the inward parts”—declare to us in the most positive manner that the words they wrote were not their own; that they received them “from above;” that they were words which not “man’s

wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth." They tell us how they were specially called, qualified and commissioned to go forth with the authoritative declaration, "THUS SAITH THE LORD!"

Shall we receive their testimony? Shall we accept their witness as true? If so we must return to the old doctrine of Plenary Inspiration. Shall we reject it? Then we are abandoning our own hypothesis. These men are not good, if they are not true. They are deceivers, forgers, liars, of the most determined kind. But this is impossible! for we have already seen that the writers of the Bible could not have been bad men. What then? There is no other alternative: The Writers of the Bible were good men and true. They were therefore what they said they were; *i. e.*, specially and Divinely Inspired.

3. I am of course perfectly aware that this argument is much too simple and unsophisticated to be very attractive to the ingenious transcendentalism of our opponents. Nor am I ignorant that for their dislike of it they may plead a stronger reason still. It is equally plain and unanswerable. The Bible is either of Divine Inspiration or of human invention. But good men neither would nor could make a book pretending to an authority they did not possess, saying "Thus saith the Lord," when the Lord had said no such thing, and it was merely their own invention. Nor would bad men write a book which enjoins all duty, exalts all virtue, and passes the severest condemnation upon themselves. Since therefore the Bible is not the invention of men either good or bad, it is "given by Inspiration of God." **TO THIS SIMPLE ARGUMENT, INTELLIGIBLE TO A CHILD, OUR ADVERSARIES HAVE NEVER YET BEEN ABLE TO FIND AN ANSWER.**

II. 1. The perfectly unique character of the writings of Moses and Paul has been already noticed. But a further demonstration of the divinity of their mission will be found in the character of the writers themselves. Thus Cellérier observes, "Every imposture has an object in view, and an aim more or less selfish. Men practise deceit for money, for pleasure, or for glory. If in order to procure the triumph of their own opinions or their own party, they do sometimes

deceive others, they may perhaps, forget their own interests during the struggle, but they again remember them when the victory is achieved. It is a general rule that no impostor forgets himself long. But Moses forgot himself, and forgot himself to the last. Yet *there is no middle supposition.* IF MOSES WAS NOT A DIVINELY INSPIRED MESSENGER, HE WAS AN IMPOSTOR IN THE STRONGEST SENSE OF THE TERM. It is not, as in the case of Numa, a slight and single fraud, designed to secure some good end, that we have to charge him with, but a series of deceits, many of which were gross; a profound, dishonest, perfidious, sanguinary dissimulation, continued for the space of forty years. If Moses was not a divinely commissioned prophet, he was not the saviour of the people, but their tyrant and their murderer.

Still, we repeat it, this barbarous impostor always forgot himself; and his disinterestedness, as regarded himself, his family, and his tribe, is one of the most extraordinary features of his administration. As to himself: He is destined to die in the wilderness; he is never to taste the tranquillity, the plenty, the delight, the possession of which he promises to his countrymen; he shares with them only their fatigues and privations; he has more anxieties than they, on their account, in their acts of disobedience, and in their perpetual murmurings. As to his family: He does not nominate his sons as his successors; he places them, without any privileges or distinctions, among the obscure sons of Levi; they are not even admitted to share the sacerdotal authority. Unlike all other fathers, Moses withdraws them from public view, and deprives them of the means of obtaining public distinction. Unlike the sons of Eli and of Samuel, the sons of Moses are merely the simple servants of the tabernacle. Is it possible to find disinterestedness more complete than this? Is this the character of a forger and an impostor? If forgery and imposture can be found in conjunction with character and conduct such as this, what are the marks of authentic history? How shall we distinguish between trickery and truth?

2. Turn now to the great apostle of the Gentiles. In Saul of Tarsus we have a man whose terrible propensities and turbulent impulses made him little better than a John of

Gishala, a zealot intoxicated with blood, "breathing out threatenings and slaughter." Yet this was the man who wrote the thirteenth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians! Psychologically, a ferocity so boisterous was no qualification for a Christian, or a philanthropist; least of all, for a quietly enduring man. Yet on his conversion to Christ, St. Paul became all this: his vehement emotions subsiding within the limits of a well regulated and noble character. Formerly hasty and irritable, now only spirited and resolved; formerly violent, now full of energy, and enterprising; once ungovernably refractory, now only persevering; once fanatical and morose, now only serious; once cruel, now only firm; formerly unrelenting, deaf to sympathy and commiseration; now himself acquainted with tears, which he had seen without effect in others. Formerly the friend of none, now the brother of mankind; benevolent, compassionate, sympathizing, yet never weak, always great; in the midst of sadness and sorrow, manly and noble. See his departure from Miletus: it is like the departure of Moses, the resignation of Samuel, sincere and heartfelt, full of self-recollection, and in the midst of pain full of dignity. His letters furnish evidence of the soundness and sobriety of his judgment. His caution in distinguishing between the occasional suggestions of inspiration, and the ordinary exertions of his natural understanding, is without example in the history of enthusiasm. His morality is everywhere calm, pure, and rational, adapted to the condition, the activity, and the business of social life, and of its various relations; free from the over-scrupulousness of superstition and the austerities of asceticism, and from, what was perhaps more to be apprehended, the abstractions of quietism and the soarings or extravagancies of fanaticism. His judgment concerning a hesitating conscience, his opinion of the moral indifferency of many actions, yet of the prudence and even the duty of compliance, where non-compliance would produce evil effects upon the minds of others, are so many proofs of the calm and discriminating character of his mind; even were we not to add that the universal applicability of his precepts affords strong presumption of his inspiration.

Nor can we fail to feel the force of Lord Lyttleton's remark

on the preference which St. Paul assigns to rectitude of principle (1 Co. xiii. 1—3). Did ever enthusiast prefer that universal benevolence here meant by “charity” to faith and to miracles, to those religious opinions which he had embraced, and to those supernatural graces and gifts which he imagined he had acquired, nay, even to the merit of martyrdom? Is it not the genius of enthusiasm to set moral virtues infinitely below the merit of faith; and of all moral virtues to value that least which, by St. Paul, is most of all enforced—a spirit of candour, moderation, and peace? Most certain it is, that nothing could be more directly opposed to the temper or opinions of a fanatic than this very passage.

To note only one other distinctive trait in the character of this remarkable man:—the impression which the idea of a universal religion wrought upon his mind. Never was any other soul so profoundly engrossed with the idea of a religion for the world. In this he was no man’s scholar; this he had immediately received from the Spirit of his Master; it was a spark of the divine light which enkindled him. It was this which never allowed him to remain in Palestine and in Syria, which so powerfully impelled him to foreign parts. Thus he began his career among the different nations of Asia Minor, and when this limit also became too confined for him, he went with equal confidence to Europe, among other nations, ordinances, sciences, and customs; and here likewise with the same indefatigable spirit he carried out his plans even to the pillars of Hercules.

“Here then we have a man of liberal attainments, and in other points, of sound judgment, who had addicted his life to the service of the gospel. We see him in the prosecution of his purpose, travelling from country to country, enduring every species of hardship, encountering every extremity of danger, assaulted by the populace, punished by the magistrates, scourged, beat, stoned, left for dead; expecting wherever he came a renewal of the same treatment, and the same dangers, yet, when driven from one city, preaching in the next; spending his whole time in the employment, sacrificing to it his pleasures, his ease, his safety; persisting in this course to old age, unaltered by the experience of perverseness, ingratitude,

prejudice, desertion ; unsubdued by anxiety, want, labour, persecutions ; unwearied by long confinement, undismayed by the prospect of death. Such was St. Paul.

“ We have his letters in our hands ; we have also a history purporting to be written by one of his fellow travellers, and appearing, by a comparison with these letters, certainly to have been written by some person well acquainted with the transactions of his life. From the letters, as well as from the history, we gather not only the account which we have stated of *him*, but that he was one out of many who acted and suffered in the same manner ; and that, of those who did so, several had been the companions of Christ’s ministry, the ocular witnesses, or pretending to be such, of his miracles, and of his resurrection. We moreover find this same person referring in his letters to his supernatural conversion, the particulars and accompanying circumstances of which are related in the history, and which accompanying circumstances, if all or any of them be true, render it impossible to have been a delusion. We also find him positively, and in appropriated terms, asserting that he himself worked miracles, strictly and properly so called, in support of the mission which he executed ; the history, meanwhile, recording various passages of his ministry, which come up to the extent of this assertion. THE QUESTION IS, WHETHER FALSEHOOD WAS EVER ATTESTED BY EVIDENCE LIKE THIS. Falsehoods, we know, have found their way into reports, into tradition, into books, but is an example to be met with, of a man voluntarily undertaking a life of want and pain, of incessant fatigue, of continual peril ; submitting to the loss of his own home and country, to stripes and stoning, to tedious imprisonment, and the constant expectation of a violent death, for the sake of carrying about a story of what was false, and of what, if false, he must have known to be so ?¹

III. PALEY’S GREAT ARGUMENT IS STILL UNANSWERED. And—judging from the pitiful attempts of our adversaries to evade its force—not only unanswered but UNANSWERABLE. Paley, we are told,² “ dedicated his powers to a factitious

¹ Horæ Paulinæ ; Conclusion.

² Essays and Reviews, p. 262.

thesis." His demonstration, "however perfect, is in unreal matter." Such are the hard words "flung at the head of Paley's great argument" by those who fear its power. Unhappily for them, however, when we proceed to examine these oracular decisions, they fall under their own censure; it is their own thesis which is purely factitious, and their own demonstrations which are in unreal matter. Paley's work is characterized by his proof of these two propositions:—

First, "That there is satisfactory evidence, that many professing to be original witnesses of the Christian miracles, passed their lives in labours, dangers, and sufferings, voluntarily undergone in attestation of the accounts which they delivered, and solely in consequence of their belief of those accounts; and that they also submitted, from the same motives, to new rules of conduct."

Second, "That there is *not* satisfactory evidence, that persons professing to be original witnesses of other miracles, in their nature as certain as these are, have ever acted in the same manner, in attestation of the accounts which they delivered, and properly in consequence of their belief of those accounts."

Now, with these propositions our opponents really know not what to do. They do not like to admit them. They are unable to refute them. They do not even venture to insinuate that Paley has failed to prove them. All they can do is to ignore them as long as possible; and when that is no longer possible, then to disparage them. The proposition is admitted to be proved; and then it is pooh-poohed as "factitious." The demonstration is admitted to be perfect; but "however perfect," is in "unreal matter." Let us see.

"A thesis wholly factitious must be one which assumes unreal facts, and argues on the supposition of their truth. Which of the two facts in Paley's thesis does the Essayist require us to disbelieve? That the Apostle and first Christians really underwent labours, dangers, and sufferings? Or that their sufferings were caused by their belief in the miracles of the Gospel and the Divine authority of Christ? Either assertion is equally preposterous. A demonstration can hardly be 'in unreal matter' when its materials are

among THE MOST CERTAIN AND NOTORIOUS FACTS IN THE HISTORY OF MANKIND."

An extract from Paley's own summary of these material facts will be sufficient to substantiate this assertion. It should be premised however, that what gives them all their weight is this :—not one of them is assumed, every one is proved.

"The truth of Christianity depends upon its leading facts, and upon them alone. Now of these we have evidence which ought to satisfy us, at least until it appear that mankind have ever been deceived by the same. We have some *uncontested* and *incontestable* points, to which the history of the human species hath nothing similar to offer. A Jewish peasant changed the religion of the world, and that, without force, without power, without support; without one natural source or circumstance of attraction, influence, or success. **SUCH A THING HATH NOT HAPPENED IN ANY OTHER INSTANCE.**

"The companions of this Person, after he himself had been put to death for his attempt, asserted his *supernatural character*, founded upon his *supernatural operations*; and, in testimony of the truth of their assertions, *i.e.*, in consequence of their own belief in that truth, and in order to communicate the knowledge of it to others, voluntarily entered upon lives of toil and hardship, and with a full experience of their danger, committed themselves to the last extremities of persecution. **THIS HATH NOT A PARALLEL.**

"More particularly, a very few days after this Person had been publicly executed, and in the very city in which he was buried, these his companions declared with one voice that his body was restored to life; that they had seen him, handled him, ate with him, conversed with him; and in pursuance of their persuasion of the truth of what they told, preached his religion, with this strange fact as the foundation of it, in the face of those who had killed him, who were armed with the power of the country, and necessarily and naturally disposed to treat his followers as they had treated himself; and having done this upon the spot where the event took place, carried the intelligence of it abroad, in despite of difficulties and opposition, and where the nature of their errand gave them nothing to

expect but derision, insult, and outrage. THIS IS WITHOUT EXAMPLE.

“These three facts, I think, are certain, and would have been nearly so, if the Gospels had never been written. The Christian story as to these points, hath never varied. No other hath been set up against it. Every letter, every discourse, every controversy, amongst the followers of the religion ; every book written by them from the age of its commencement to the present time, in every part of the world in which it hath been professed, and with every sect into which it hath been divided (and we have letters and discourses written by cotemporaries, by witnesses of the transaction, by persons themselves bearing a share in it, and other writings following that age in regular succession) *concur* in representing these facts in this manner. A religion which now possesses the greatest part of the civilized world, unquestionably sprang up at Jerusalem at this time. Some account must be given of its origin ; some cause assigned for its rise. All the accounts of this origin, all the explications of this cause . . . either expressly allege the facts above stated as the means by which the religion was set up, or advert to its commencement in a manner which agrees with the supposition of these facts being true, and which testifies their operation and effects.

“THESE PROPOSITIONS ALONE LAY A FOUNDATION FOR OUR FAITH ; for they prove the existence of a transaction, which cannot even in its most *general* parts be accounted for, upon any reasonable supposition, except that of the truth of the mission.”

Passing over the particulars by which he shows the authenticity of the Christian Scriptures now in our hands to be established,³ we find the chief characteristics of the Christian miracles thus distinguished :—

“In viewing the detail of miracles recorded in these books, we find every supposition negatived, by which they can be resolved into fraud or delusion. They were not secret, nor momentary, nor tentative, nor ambiguous ; nor performed under the sanction of authority, with the spectators on their

³ Paley’s “Evidences,” pp. 68, 298. (Ed. 1850.)

side, or in affirmation of tenets and practices already established. We find also the evidence alleged for them, and which evidence was by great numbers received, different from that on which other miraculous accounts rest. It was cotemporary, it was published upon the spot, it continued ; it involved interests and questions of the greatest magnitude : it contradicted the most fixed persuasions and prejudices of the persons to whom it was addressed ; it required from those who accepted it, not a simple, indolent assent, but a change, from thenceforward, of principles and conduct, a submission to consequences the most serious and the most deterring, to loss and danger, to insult, outrage and persecution. How such a story should be false, or, if false, how under such circumstances it should make its way, I think impossible to be explained ; yet such the Christian story was, such were the circumstances under which it came forth, and in opposition to such difficulties did it prevail.”⁴

Utterly inadequate as these brief extracts must be to convey a just idea of the complete success of Paley’s argument, they may yet serve in part to shew (what few students of the evidences can have failed to feel,) the simple justice of the eulogy pronounced by Robert Hall, when he characterized “Paley’s Evidences” as “probably without exception the most clear and satisfactory statement of the historical proofs of the Christian religion exhibited in any age or country.” The single point to be especially noted here however, is this ; that however (by those who dislike it) the argument may be disparaged, its force remains UNIMPAIRED.

IV. BP. BUTLER’S ARGUMENT ALSO, IS STILL UNANSWERED, AND—UNANSWERABLE. Dealing with the actual facts and observations of every-day life, our adversaries find it impossible to describe it as dealing with “unreal matter.” But they dislike it none the less. They are as unreasonable as the “children in the market-place.” “The reading even of the *Analogy*,” we are told, is “so depressing to the soul :” we weary of it as “we weary of a long journey on foot, especially through deep sand.”⁵ Not a doubt of it ! Had it only left them a single

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 299.

⁵ *Essays and Reviews*, p. 293.

standing-point, how welcome had it been ! But as it is—leaving them not even one solitary spot where they may set their foot—how wearisome !

1. In the First Part of this (inconveniently troublesome !) “Analogy,” it is shown that the immortality of the soul, and its existence in a future life, as a stated and fixed law of God’s Providence, must be admitted on the evidence of Reason.

It is then shown “as a plain matter of fact, rather than a deduction of reason,” that, in the present world, we are as much under God’s government, as under that of the civil magistrate. The Bishop then considers those objections against the credibility of a future state of Rewards and Punishments, which may be drawn from the frailty of human nature as doing away with the guilt of human vices ; or from the doctrine of Necessity and Fatalism ; or from an idea that the will of a Supreme Being cannot be contradicted, or that He cannot be provoked ; and shows that the analogies furnished by the facts of every-day life are such as to *answer fully* all those objections : such as are full of awe to “persons the most free from enthusiasm, and of the greatest strength of mind.”

God’s government is then shown to be Moral ; and our Present State, one of Trial, and Moral Discipline. The very notion of Necessity or Fatalism is shewn to be a plain “contradiction to the whole constitution of Nature, and to what we may every moment experience in ourselves ;” while all objections against God’s Moral Government are refuted by the fact that we are in (necessary) ignorance of most of the particulars essential to a right comprehension of so vast a scheme.

2. The Second Part commences with a demonstration of the importance of Christianity. Viewed in its lowest aspect, Christianity is an *authoritative* republication of Natural Religion. But besides this, it set up a visible Church to attest the Truth in all ages. In its characteristic aspect, it is distinguished as a Revelation of things undiscoverable by Reason.

The untenability of the presumptions against Miracles is next demonstrated ; and then **IT IS PROVED THAT THE OBJECTIONS** raised against the *scheme* of Christianity (as well as those against its *evidence*) **ARE FRIVOLOUS.** Objections against

particular parts of Revelation follow:— The need of a Mediator; Christ as a Propitiatory Sacrifice; the non-universality of Christianity:— and then we come to a consideration of “The Particular Evidence for Christianity:” *i.e.*, the direct and collateral evidence as, together with miracles and prophecy, making up one great argument in its favour. And this argument is thus summed up:—

Holy Scripture contains a history of this world for nearly six thousand years, for, after all, prophecy is but the history of events before they come true in fact; and doctrines and precepts are matters of fact also. And this history is amply corroborated from other sources. The chronology of Scripture is undoubtedly true; and the past history and present condition of the Jewish nation, compared with prophecy, combine to make a standing miracle. And, in fine, the promised Messiah did actually live and die on earth, did work miracles and establish his religion in the world. THESE ARE ALL PLAIN HISTORICAL FACTS, WHICH CANNOT BE SET ASIDE.

Now, let any one read the above history for the first time, and, on asking whether it be really true, let him be informed of the several acknowledged facts which are found to correspond with it in daily life; then let him compare together the history and the prophecy, and observe the astonishing coincidence of both; such a joint review must appear to him, at the very least, to possess great weight, and to amount to EVIDENCE MORE THAN HUMAN. And unless the whole series and chain of events be considered as the result of mere accident, the truth of Christianity is at once established for all practical purposes; for the credibility of the common history of Scripture, and its miraculous history, are so interwoven as to imply each other, and they must stand or fall together.

Finally, in refuting the objections which may be brought against this mode of arguing from analogy, and pointing out the precise force of his own Treatise, the Bishop thus concludes:— “Those who believe, will here find the scheme of Christianity cleared of objections, and the evidence of it in a peculiar manner strengthened: those who do not believe, will at least be shown THE ABSURDITY OF ALL ATTEMPTS TO PROVE CHRIS-

TIANITY FALSE ; the plain undoubted credibility of it ; and, I hope, a good deal more.”⁶

The more we review the whole argument, the more impossible does it become to avoid the conclusion of an eminent living authority :⁷—“ I am convinced that Butler is not to be refuted.⁸ . . . Assuredly, for the specific object in view, no book written by man was ever more conclusive than that of Butler . . . and the conclusiveness of his logic has been shown in this, that however easily ‘analogies’ may be ‘retorted,’ the parties affected by it have never answered it.” “ Butler wrote but little ; but when reading him I have often thought of Walter Scott’s old wolf-dog, Maida, who seldom was tempted to join in the bark of his lesser canine associates. ‘He seldom opens his mouth,’ said his master ; ‘but when he does, he shakes the Eildon hills. Maida is like the great gun at Constantinople—it takes a long time to load it ; but when it *does* go off, it goes off for something !’ ”

V. To take but one other instance—

LESLIE’S DEMONSTRATION of the Truth of Christianity IS STILL UNANSWERED, AND UNANSWERABLE. Here the argument is neither long nor complicated ; plain and simple as the Truth itself, it lays no tax on the leisure or patience of any ; and lies open to the comprehension of all. It consists in his

(a) Laying down such marks, as to the truth of matters of fact in general, that where they all meet, such matters of fact cannot be false ; and then

(b) Showing that they all do meet in the matters of fact of Moses, and of Christ ; and do not meet in those reported of Mohammed, or of the heathen deities, nor can possibly meet in any imposture whatsoever.

The marks are these :—

1. That the facts be such as men’s outward senses can judge of ;

⁶ Analogy of Religion, Part II, ch. viii.

⁷ Mr. H. Rogers, in “The Eclipse of Faith.”

⁸ “ Whether shall we place higher the name of Newton or of But-

ler? Each, at all events, is the greatest in his own department.” (Inaugural Address of the Bp. of London, at the Edinbro’ Philosophical Institution : Nov. 4, 1864.)

2. That it be performed publicly, in the presence of witnesses :

3. That there be public monuments and actions kept up in memory of it ; and,

4. That such documents and actions shall be established and commence, at the time of the fact.

The two first of these marks make it impossible for any false fact to be imposed upon men at the time when it was said to have occurred, because every man's senses would contradict it. The two last make it equally impossible that the credulity of after-ages should be induced to believe, as real, things which were only fictitious. It is not pretended that every thing which wants these four marks is false ; but it is fearlessly asserted that every thing which has them all must be true. Few things in ordinary history, even when received without question as undoubtedly true, do actually combine these four marks of truth : *e.g.*, the existence of Julius Caesar, his victory at Pharsalia, etc. But they are all found in the Scripture History of Moses and of Christ ; and their presence furnishes an INFALLIBLE PROOF that this history is true.

To these are subjoined "four additional marks ; the three last of which, no matter of fact, how true soever, either has had, or can have, except that of Christ."

When to this we add that none of the persecutors of Christianity, whether Jewish or Roman, when referred to by its first teachers as witnesses of its great facts, ever ventured to deny them ; that no apostate disciple, under the fear of punishment, or the hope of reward, (not even the artful and accomplished Julian himself !) ever pretended to detect in them any deception ; that neither learning nor ingenuity, in the long lapse of so many years, have been able to show their falsehood ; although, for the first three centuries after their promulgation, the civil government strongly stimulated hostile enquiry ; while their original relators, after lives of uninterrupted hardship, joyfully incurred death in attestation of their truth—*we cannot imagine the possibility of a more perfect or abundant demonstration.*

If, after all, there remain any who think they can resist the overwhelming force of evidence like this, Let them produce their Cæsar or Mohammed,

1. Performing a fact, of which man's outward senses can judge ;
2. Publicly in the presence of witnesses ;
3. In memory of which public monuments and actions are kept up ;
4. Instituted and commencing at the time of the fact ;
5. Recorded likewise in a set of books, addressed to the identical people before whom it was performed, and containing their whole code of civil and ecclesiastical laws ;
6. As the work of one previously announced for that very period by a long train of prophecies ;
7. And still more peculiarly prefigured by types both of a circumstantial and personal nature, from the earliest ages ; and lastly,
8. Of such a character as made it impossible for either the relators or the hearers to believe it, if false, without supposing a universal deception of the senses of mankind.

Further: Let them display, in its professed eye-witnesses, similar proofs of veracity ; in some doctrines founded upon it, and unaided by force or intrigue, a like triumph over the prejudices and passions of mankind ; among its believers, equal skill and equal diligence, in scrutinizing its evidences,—

Or, let them submit to THE IRRESISTIBLE CERTAINTY OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

CHAPTER XVI.

IT IS CERTAIN : THAT THE MOST RECENT, SUBTLE, AND POWERFUL ASSAULTS ON THE BIBLE HAVE UTTERLY FAILED TO SHAKE THE FOUNDATIONS OF OUR FAITH.

“Can length of years on God Himself exact?
Or make that fiction, which was once a fact?”—COWPER.

SURVEYING the immoveable ground of Certainty traversed in the last chapter, one naturally asks—What is the ground in possession of our adversaries? And the answer is, “A tissue of Uncertainties—nothing more!” Not all the ingenuity ever exhibited on the side of unbelief has availed to substantiate a single argument against Christianity. Not one of all the pretexts ever devised by that ingenuity, that has not been triumphantly refuted and destroyed. It may be useful, in this chapter, to corroborate the correctness of these two assertions by some instances drawn from recent publications.

I. 1. Take a single instance from “Essays and Reviews.” What could be more insulting than the bitter mocking tone of contemptuous derision in which the writer of the Second Essay spoke of those who professed their faith in the old-fashioned Bible? How loud his boastful bravados on behalf of his idol, his “remorseless criticism,” and his “vast induction on the destructive side!” Now, what was it all worth? What was the amount of actual fact substantiated in evidence against the Bible? The answer to this question shall be given (not in the words of some bigoted believer, but) in the words of the most eminent of all the apologists for the Essays themselves:—

“Conclusions arrived at by the life-long labours of a great German theologian are pitchforked into the face of the English

public who never heard of them before, with hardly a shred of argument to clothe their repulsive forms.”¹

It may help the reader however, to appraise at their proper value these “life-long labours of a great German theologian,” to be told that even this admirer of Bunsen, this eulogist of Prof. Jowett,² and sturdy apologist for the Essays, goes on to say in the very next sentence:—

“ASSERTIONS which even the learned and sceptical would hesitate to receive after long discussion, ARE ASSUMED AS CERTAIN, WITHOUT A WORD OF PROOF, and without any connexion with the context in which they occur.”

Nor does he fail to establish this charge against his friends; for in a note he adds:—

“Such is Mr. Wilson’s statement respecting the date of the fourth Gospel, (p. 116,) and that ‘the taking of Jerusalem by Shishak is for the Hebrew history that which the sacking of Rome by the Gauls is for the Roman.’ (p. 170.) This last ASSERTION WHOLLY UNSUPPORTED BY ARGUMENT, IS, not only according to our humble belief, but according to the whole tenor of the great work of Ewald, EQUALLY UNTENABLE IN ITS NEGATIVE AND POSITIVE ASPECT.”

2. So much for the character of the attack: but how triumphant was the defence which that attack provoked! The “Replies” were Legion; and few of them but were worthy of the occasion. Of those which still stand in the front rank, Mr. Birks’s admirable volume³ alone supplies a complete refutation, without conceding one inch of ground; while among the writers of two others⁴ we have a combination of the learning, the eloquence, and the conclusive argumentation of ten of the first men of our times. Any one of these three volumes is more than a sufficient answer to “Essays and Reviews”; but taken altogether, they present an aggregate of solid learning and valuable thought, the like of which the Church has

¹ Edinburgh Review, 1861, p. 474.

² “The production of Professor Jowett has a significance of its own... He stands confessedly master of the situation in the eyes of

the rising generation of English students and theologians.” (Ibid. p. 476.)

³ The Bible & Modern Thought.

⁴ “Aids to Faith,” & “Replies.”

scarcely had offered to her in any former year of modern times.

II. 1. Very much the same must be said of Bp. Colenso's productions; and of the answers they have evoked. He publishes a volume of what he calls "insuperable difficulties;" and forthwith there step forward champions of the Faith who solve them one by one. Than Dr. Mc. Caul, "there is no Jewish Rabbi, either in England or on the Continent, more conversant with every form of Hebrew literature, and no man in England who is more intimately acquainted with the German writers for and against the truth, the 'real scholars' to whom Dr. Colenso appeals."⁵ But this same Dr. Mc. Caul has not only met the difficulties proposed by the Bishop—met them fairly and fully—but he has shewn that every problem is capable of at least one solution. In many he submits two or three, taking first the difficulty as stated by the Bishop, and shewing that if even it were real it would not be insuperable; afterwards proving that it is of the critic's own making. Some of the most remarkable of these difficulties result entirely from the critic's unauthorized additions to the Sacred Text; some from omissions and perversions, the result of careless haste or excessive zeal; many from ignorance so gross as to evince the writer's utter disqualification for the task he has undertaken; but among them all there is not one which, when cleared from misrepresentation and mistake, can fairly be laid to the charge of the Sacred Writer himself.

2. Mr. Birks's refutation of the Bishop's argument, though proceeding by another method than that of Dr. Mc. Caul, reaches the same result. He deals less with the Hebrew and more with the arithmetic of his opponent. The result is, that (in the words of an able reviewer,) "The arithmetician is beaten on his own ground." "Mr. Birks does not propose, as Dr. Mc. Caul has done, to give several alternatives, every one of which may be a *possible* solution of a difficulty, and therefore sufficient to silence an objector. He selects one which he

⁵ See Dr. Colenso's Letter to the "Athenæum."

⁶ The Christian Advocate and Review, vol. iii. p. 326.

believes to be the surest and the best, and which may by itself bear the whole weight of the argument. This he follows out in all its bearings upon the question. Its cumulative weight and strength become so great, that it seems to be after all much more than an hypothesis—much more than a possible or probable solution. It approaches to certainty ; it may be wielded not only for defence, but as an instrument of attack against the enemy.” “The most careful and studious reader will find nothing superficial here ; no hasty assumptions,—no imperfectly examined theories. It is the reply of the Wrangler of Trinity, to his fellow Wrangler of St. John’s ; and there can be no question at all about the thoroughness of the investigation, or the triumphant success of the argument. It is not so much the novelty or originality of the proposed solutions which characterizes the volume, rather it is the laborious minuteness of the details, and the almost merciless pursuit of the adversary into every corner and cranny of his defences. It is an answer in full to Dr. Colenso’s objections ; in many cases it is an utter demolition of them.”

3. But besides the demolition of objections, there is the positive evidence adduced in demonstration of the Truth which defies objections. Dr. Mc. Caul shews a continuous stream of evidence (from the latest page of the New Testament, traced backward to its source, in the time of Joshua) for the existence of a book called “The Law of the Lord.” He demands a refutation of this evidence. Mr. Birks, though adducing his evidence from the English Version only, yet accumulates an amount so overwhelming and conclusive, that ten thousand difficulties such as those of Dr. Colenso, could not only never outweigh it, but never even greatly diminish its force. He shows that the whole Bible is full of the Law. The spirit of these five Books informs the Old Testament and the New. The authenticity and inspiration of the Psalms, the Prophets, and the Gospels depend on the same proofs as those which establish the Books of Moses to be the Word and Will of God.

4. The Bishop of Ely’s work⁷ has a peculiar value. He

⁷ The Pentateuch and The Elo- | Professor of Divinity. (Parker and
histic Psalms. By the Norrisian | Son, 1863.)

has clearly shewn that Dr. Colenso's conclusions would not follow, even on the admission of all his premises. All the great facts of Bible history remain firm and immovable, though the arithmetical puzzle and the apparent interpolations and anachronisms of the text be found incapable of solution. He shews that the three facts, for instance, of the residence of the Jews in Egypt, their long wanderings in the Desert, and their conquest of Canaan, could no more be disputed than the invasion of England by the Saxons or the Danes. These three facts have given a strongly marked character to all their literature, and to the life of the whole people to this day. These facts must not only be admitted, they must be accounted for, and the Bible history is not only the best, it is the only conceivable way of accounting for them. "Besides a number of solutions of minor difficulties, the carefully elaborated argument of Dr. Colenso on the Elohistic and Jehovistic Psalms is met, and utterly demolished, in the most simple and intelligible manner. The principle of Dr. Colenso's argument is this, that the use of the word 'Elohim' for God is a proof that such a chapter or psalm is of earlier date than one in which 'Jehovah' is freely and commonly used. Professor Browne has shewn that the Psalms when examined by their language, and even by their titles, prove the very reverse of what is contended for; the more ancient ones being precisely those in which the name Jehovah is most frequently used. This whole theory of determining the age and character of a document by the use of the Divine name is completely overthrown, and the argument neutralized by the fact that there are the same unaccountable, and apparently capricious changes from the use of one name to another, in later portions of Scripture, where the document-theory and the age and authorship of the composition can offer no solution. In the book of Proverbs only 'Jehovah' is found, in the book of Ecclesiastes only 'God.' In the book of Job, 'God' is found in all the *verse* and 'Jehovah' in all the *prose*. In short, the evidence is clear as the sun, that whatever determined the choice of the writers in the use of the Divine names, it certainly was a *free choice*. The use of one name does not prove ignorance of the other, nor does it even prove what was the usage of the time, for

strange to say, in the prophet Daniel the name 'Jehovah' only occurs in the 9th chapter, and in that chapter no less than six times! . . . We can truly say we have read no book which has given us such a feeling of conscious safety from even partial and temporary harm. It strengthens our convictions that the foundations of the truth are laid deep and secure, and that the whole superstructure is worthy of that kingdom which 'cannot be shaken,' but which must for ever and ever remain."⁸

III. After the curiosities of Colenso comes the romance of Renan. But after what has been said above, is there any need to say more in proof of its utter inutility and fallacy as an apology for scepticism? Surely not. It is in all respects

A TRIUMPH FOR THE TRUTH!

"A well-meaning, clear-headed, scholar-like man has come forward to show how Jesus might have founded the Christian religion by His own unaided genius, apart from any supernatural qualification, personal or relative. Most reluctantly he has been obliged to pourtray him as an *enthusiast and an impostor*. He has used every artifice to soften down the charge. He has lavished upon him, what, coming from him, must be called unmeaning adulation. He has apologised for his falsehood, till he is in danger of charging him with lunacy. He has made him yield to the persuasion of others, till he becomes chargeable with irresolution and imbecility. He allows him to confuse the imaginary with the real, till he becomes a visionary, looking forward to a perfectly utopian kingdom; so that after all, the characters drawn by this new apologist is expressed by St. Paul in two single words, not complimentary to mortals even of ordinary standing, *πλανῶν καὶ πλανῶμενος*, 'Deceiving and being deceived.' The *Vie de Jesus* is in fact a *reductio ad absurdum*. It shows that the Founder of the Christian religion could have been *none other* than THE SON OF GOD; and that the history of His birth and life, and ministry and death, *cannot but be ALL TRUE.*"⁹

IV. There is a large class of persons however, who in the romance of Renan and the calculations of Colenso can see

⁸ The Christian Advocate and Review, vol. iii. p. 466.

⁹ Ibid. p. 510.

nothing more than an exercise of the characteristic ingenuity of those gentlemen, but who think it is from the progress of scientific discovery that the old faith in the Bible has most to fear. They are well assured that the principal difficulties of the Bishop of Natal exist only in his own imagination ; and that the fanciful portraiture drawn by M. Renan, so far from reflecting the actual Christ of the Gospels, is merely the visionary ideal of the most skilful of all romancers. But while they rightly regard these as idle speculations, they turn to the facts of Science as solid truths.

“To THE FACTS of Science” : yes ; and so do we. But not to the supposed facts ; not to mere presumptions or probable conjectures ; but to facts that have been proved. Let theologians only beware of making Scripture responsible for what may after all be only some hasty assumptions of their own ; and let philosophers be no less cautious in obtruding their fancied discoveries as proving the erroneousness of Scripture ; and we shall soon cease to be told that Scripture and Science are at variance. Meantime it is important to note the fact that Science properly so called—while it has done very much to establish—has done absolutely nothing whatever to overthrow “the old faith in the Bible.” We have seen in the preceding pages¹⁰ the professors of different sciences, the partisans of different schools, arrayed not only against each other but against themselves, on all those points which involve the correctness (and consequent Inspiration) of Scripture. The votaries of Science must settle their own controversies—must ascertain to their mutual satisfaction what IS fact—before they can presume to assert that the declarations of the Bible are contrary to fact. And this, often as it has been attempted, has yet never been achieved. Not all the unquestionable ability of Sir Charles Lyell, Prof. Huxley, and Mr. Darwin, has availed to discover one solitary indisputable fact at variance with the plain declarations of the Bible.

Nor is this all. He who undertakes to set up Science in opposition to Scripture must needs find all the Certainty on one side and all the Uncertainty on the other. The Certainties

¹⁰ *Vide supra*, pp. 198—273.

of Science are corroborative of the Certainty of Scripture: that which admits of being represented as antagonistic to Scripture is merely a tissue of Uncertainties. How many of the alleged discoveries adduced to prove the high Antiquity of Man might we have been spared, if their originators had but showed the caution displayed by Professor Owen at Jarrow!¹¹ How very few admit of satisfactory verification! And then besides the original uncertainty as to the actual facts, there is the further uncertainty of doubtful computations based on the data which those (supposed) facts (are supposed to) furnish. Thus, to take a recent instance, we are informed (in the Report of the Proceedings of the British Association at Bath) that "A careful computation by Professor W. Thompson, on selected data, which determines the rate of cooling of earthly masses, assigns

¹¹ The lesson taught by the incident here referred to is one which calls for such frequent reiteration in these days of rash and positive speculation, as to justify the insertion, in this place, of the account given by Professor Owen himself, at the Meeting of the British Association in 1858;—

"Professor Owen said that some time ago he was sent for to the North, to examine a fossilized tree, which had been found in digging the Jarrow dock, which bore undoubted evidence of having been cut by human hands. It was supposed to be a most important discovery, as showing the antiquity of the human race; and at first every thing appeared satisfactory. On prosecuting his enquiries, however, he learnt that one of the navvies, not then on the works, was said to have discovered a similar tree, in another part of the dock, which he cut to lay down a sleeper. The man was sent for, and on his arrival he

declared that the tree pointed out was the one he had cut. It was endeavoured to be explained that this was impossible, as the place had not been excavated before; but, looking with supreme contempt on the assembly of geologists and engineers, the man persisted in the identification of his own work, and exclaimed, 'The top of the tree must be somewhere.' Upon which he (Professor Owen) offered half-a-crown to the first navvy who produced it. Away ran half-a-dozen of them, and in a few minutes they returned with the top. This explained the mystery. The man had cut off the top with his spade; the stump afterwards got covered up with silt, and on being again uncovered, it was supposed a great discovery. Never had he so narrow an escape from introducing 'a new discovery' into science, and never had he a more fortunate escape."

98,000,000 years for the whole period of the cooling of the earth's crust, from a state of fusion to its present condition ; so that, in his judgment, within one hundred millions of years all our speculations regarding the solid earth must be limited. On the other hand, Professor Haughton finds from the data which he adopts, 1,018 millions of years to have elapsed while the earth was cooled from 212 degrees Fahrenheit, to 122 degrees Fahrenheit, at which temperature we may suppose the waters to have become habitable ; and 1,280 millions of years more in cooling from 122 degrees to 77 degrees, which is assumed to represent the climate of the later Eocene period in Britain. Computations of this kind cannot be applied, except on the large scale here exemplified, and they lose all their value in the eyes of those who deny the general doctrine of a cooling globe." Is it to be wondered at if they "lose all their value in the eyes of those" also who deny the validity of all doctrines based merely on conjecture ? No one attempts to impeach the correctness of these gentlemen's computations ; but what is the value of correct computations founded on incorrect data ? Conclusions so widely divergent as these—results, one of which is twenty times as great as the other—cannot *both* be right. And yet these are the results obtained by "philosophers of eminence," "two eminent mathematicians!" Is this the certainty of philosophy ? Is this the highest result obtainable by "careful computation" and mathematical accuracy ? Well and wisely did Professor Phillips, in adducing these specimens, point out the inevitable uncertainty which must attach to them.¹² Is it improbable that he remembered his own pertinent question addressed to the Geological Society, four years before ?—"Is not this abuse of arithmetic likely to lead to a low estimate of the evidence in

¹² In these words (—preceding those above quoted—)

"The time required to produce these effects can be calculated, if we know at what rate in time, whether uniform or not, they were produced ; if we know, not

the true rate, but the limits within which it must have operated, the result of the calculation will have a corresponding uncertainty ; if we have no knowledge of the rate, calculations are out of the question. In applying this gen-

support of such random conclusions, and of the uncritical judgment which so readily accepts them?"

Referring to other, yet not dissimilar assumptions, the writer of *The Times* leader on the inaugural address of the President for the year, (Sir Chas. Lyell,) remarks—"Cases of this kind cannot but make us cautious in yielding to the claims of scientific dogmatism. Relative ignorance may be a good reason for expressing no opinion on a disputed point, but it is no reason for receiving and echoing that of the last speaker or writer. Whatever may be the weight of the presumptions, it is vain to deny that many so-called 'results' of geology are hypothetical—hypothetical in that sense in which Newton protested against hypotheses. Few of these have been more generally adopted than that of 'an original central heat and the igneous fluidity of the earth's nucleus'; yet here we find one of the greatest living geologists guarding himself against the appearance of building on it. 'The manner in which volcanoes have shifted their position' is not more remarkable, and is much less certain, than the manner in which professors of geology have shifted their position in these high regions of conjecture; and while we pay them the deference due to their superior knowledge, we may well limit our intellectual homage to a provisional assent."

We repeat these words—we accept this testimony of a witness who will not be suspected of partiality on our side:—"It is vain to deny that many so-called 'results' of geology are hypothetical—hypothetical in that sense in which Newton protested against hypotheses;" and because they are so, they are as powerless as the speculations of Mr. Darwin, or the paradoxes of Professor Huxley, to shake the foundations of our well-grounded confidence in the CERTAINTY of those revealed truths wherein we have been instructed.

eral view to the history of the earth, philosophers of eminence in physical science have employed different considerations and obtained a variety of results. The conclusions of two eminent mathematicians which have lately

appeared may be cited with advantage. A careful computation by Professor W. Thompson, on selected data," &c., &c., as above. (Prof. Phillips's Address on opening the proceedings of Section C: Geology. Sep. 15, 1864.)

CHAPTER XVII.

IT IS CERTAIN : THAT AGAINST THE EVIDENCE FOR CHRISTIANITY—CUMULATIVE AND CONGRUOUS AS IT IS—
OUR OPPONENTS ARE UNABLE TO MAINTAIN
ANY SINGLE ARGUMENT WHATEVER.

“ Do you ask me to bring forward irresistible proof that Christianity is from Heaven ? I can do this to such an extent as that you will fail, by any fair means to overthrow my argument.”—ISAAC TAYLOR.

“ Tell me all that ever you heard against Christianity from its enemies : I am more than able to refute them all. THE EVIDENCES OF OUR RELIGION ARE OVERWHELMING.”—Dr. CHALMERS.

“ ON a subject like that of the Christian Evidences, a man of powerful and comprehensive mind, after he has once made himself master of the argument, feels on all occasions that the approach of doubt is nothing but a symptom of some momentary torpor of the reasoning faculty ; and in alarm, not so much for the question, as for the integrity of his own powers, he rouses a manly strength, and shakes off the debility that had crept upon him. That this sort of vigorous faith does not more often show itself among Christians, is because the two elements whence it should spring are but rarely united : for, on the one hand, those whose fervent piety gives them an interior or experimental conviction of the truth of the Scriptures, are not very often, in any good degree, familiar with the documentary argument, or perhaps have not the intellectual power requisite for appreciating its force. And, on the other hand, the few who do possess these advantages, too often labour under coldness at heart, or a secularity of character, which makes Christianity and its principal doctrines distasteful, or unintelligible.” But a healthy intellectual energy, enlivened by

the fervour and ingenuousness of a cordial faith, carries the mind forward in full course, clear of frivolous sophisms, to the great facts, whether more or less mysterious, that are distinctly affirmed or indubitably implied in the Scriptures.

To review the principal facts with which our argument is concerned :—

It is certain

I. That the “inner principle” is insufficient for human need.¹

The Grecian peasants, of whom Mr. Parker tells us, doing homage to Phœbus Apollo, grim-faced Calmucks worshipping the great god of storms, savages with their hands smeared all over with the blood of human sacrifices,—these, though humbling, are instructive exhibitions of the insufficiency of Conscience, or Reason, or the Moral Intuitions, or the “inner principle,” to raise mankind from the degradation of a depraved nature. Nor these alone: Mr. Parker himself has shown us that Conscience, in his own case, was unable to restrain him from bearing false witness against his neighbour, by affirming it to be a Protestant doctrine, “That God would slaughter men in hell by the million, for having committed no fault except that of not believing an absurd doctrine they had never heard of.”

II. It follows therefore, that an “outer Law” is necessary.¹

When Paley sat down to write his “Evidences,” he deemed it unnecessary to prove that mankind stood in need of a revelation, because he had “met with no serious person who thought that even under the Christian Revelation we have too much light, or any degree of assurance which is superfluous.” He added that, in judging of Christianity, it should be remembered that “the question lies between this religion and none: for, if the Christian religion be not credible, no one, with whom we have to do, will support the pretensions of any other.” Mr. Newman is one of that large class of persons who have an invincible dislike for “evidences”; and no man has done more to exalt the inward light, and the inner principle; yet even he—remembering the many dark phases, and final eclipse of his

¹ *Vide supra*, pp. 357—360.

own faith—will certainly not venture to say that “we have too much light, or any degree of assurance which is superfluous.”

III. But this outer Law, thus indispensably necessary, must be shown to be Divine, or men will not receive it as Authoritative. In what way can its Divine origin be attested (—in the first instance—) but by miracles? In none which we are able to conceive.^{1†} Consequently, in whatever degree it is probable, or not very improbable, that a revelation should be communicated to mankind at all; in the same degree it is probable, or not very improbable that miracles should be wrought.

IV. It is certain that the Bible is such a Law; and has been so attested.

It is the common language of our opponents—“Christianity is an exceptive instance because it comes to us laden with miracles, which no evidence can avail to authenticate; and in truth we are granting it more indulgence than it can rightly claim, when we concede to it any footing at all upon the ground of rational argumentation. Let Christianity rid itself of the supernatural and then we will think about it.” But this language is altogether untenable. Again and again has it been proved that, “in the instance of the canonical documents of Christianity, the connexion of the historic mass with the supernatural, is a case of cohesion, and that it is absolutely indissoluble.”^{2‡}

“Remove from Christianity everything in it which is supernatural and divine, and then the problem which we have to do with is this:—A revolution in human affairs, in the highest degree beneficial in its import, was carried forward upon the arena of the great world, by means of the noble behaviour of men who command our sympathy and admiration, as brave, wise, and good. But this revolution drew the whole of its moral force from a Belief, which—how shall we designate it?—was in part an inexplicable illusion; in part a dream, and in large part a fraud! This, the greatest forward movement

^{1†} Those who demur to this statement will do well to read that amusing and instructive chapter in “The Eclipse of Faith,” which describes “The Paradise of Fools.”

^{2‡} See (e.g.) “The Restoration of Belief,” p. 121, *et seq.* Or Bishop Butler, quoted above, p. 431.

which the civilized branches of the human family have ever made, took its rise in bewildered Jewish brains! Indestructible elements of advancement to which even infidel nations confessedly owe whatever is best and most hopeful within them, these elements of good, which were obtained for us at so vast a cost, had their source in a congeries of exaggerations, and in a mindless conspiracy, hatched by chance, nursed by imposture, and winged by fanaticism!"

V. Further: It is certain that the Bible is now substantially and essentially the same as when first given.

This affirmation is not affected by questions of authorship; or of Various Readings. The number of these latter in the Old Testament alone is thirty thousand; but their consequence and value are in exactly inverse ratio to their demand on our labour and patience. To estimate their practical value (in either Old or New Testament) as an element of uncertainty,

Take any thousand, and see how many will vary even the most literal translation in any modern language:

Then see how many (or rather how few) of those which have changed a *word*, have at all affected the *sense*:

Lastly, of these changes of expression, see how few have touched a *fact* or *doctrine*, or any point of the least importance beyond the mere question of textual accuracy.³

The text of the New Testament has been all but miraculously preserved.⁴ The care of Divine Providence in bringing the same text from the most opposite quarters, and from parts of the church diametrically opposed to each other in faith and practice, is as great a miracle as if the original autographs of the writers had been kept to this day.

Besides: It is not necessary to the possession of the Word

³ For example: see above, pp. 133, 184.

⁴ Ibid. Compare the statement there made as to the variations in the Comedies of Terence. All the criticism which has been concentrated on the Sacred Text since the time of Bentley, has but served to confirm the truth of his

observation, that The New Testament has suffered less injury by the errors of transcribers than the works of any profane author of the same size and antiquity; that is, *there never was any writing in the preservation and purity of which the world was so interested or so careful.*

of God that we should have a mathematically accurate text.⁵ The moral assurance of its logical exactness, which we do possess is even more satisfactory to our faith than the existence of any autograph copy could be ; the identity of which must, after all, rest on evidence which no infidel would receive.

VI. We have already seen that—apart from the Bible—nothing is more true than the great facts of Christianity.⁶ No historical fact is more certain than that the original propagators of Christianity voluntarily subjected themselves to lives of fatigue, danger, and suffering, in the prosecution of their undertaking. The testimony of Pliny, above cited,⁷ proves also that both the teachers and converts of the religion, in consequence of their new profession, took up a new course of life and behaviour. Now, what did they do this for? There can be but one answer: The narrative of Tacitus (quoted above) makes it certain that it was for *a miraculous story of some kind or other.*⁸ The institution of The Lord's Day—the transference of the Sabbath to the “first day of the week”—makes it still more certain that that miraculous story was the story of Christ's Resurrection.

These facts are undeniably true. But their relation to the religion founded upon them is such that *if the facts be not false, the religion must be true.*⁹ The first preachers of Chris-

⁵ “The autographs of the Bible have never existed together.” Hence, a Bible “gifted with this ideal and mathematical perfection has never been in the hands of a single human being.” But notwithstanding this, the flaws incurred in transmission, “few in number, and chiefly in numerical readings or lists of names, cannot affect in the least the direct evidence which affixes a Divine sanction to all the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.” (Rev. T. R. Birks, in “The Bible and Modern Thought;” and “Christian Advocate and Review,” vol. iii. p. 343.)

⁶ See above, p. 427—434.

⁷ P. 387.

⁸ “In whatever degree, or in whatever part, the religion was *argumentative*, when it came to the question, ‘Is the carpenter's son of Nazareth the person whom we are to receive and obey?’ there was nothing but the miracles attributed to him, by which his pretensions could be maintained for a moment. Every controversy and every question must presuppose these.” (Paley's Ev. Pt. I. ch. vi.)

⁹ “If every one of the Canonical books of the New Testament—every one of those in behalf of

tianity could not be deceivers. "By only not bearing testimony, they might have avoided all their sufferings, and have lived quietly. Would men in such circumstances pretend to have seen what they never saw ; assert facts which they had no knowledge of ; go about lying, to teach virtue ; and though not only convinced of Christ's being an impostor, but having seen the success of his imposture in his crucifixion, yet persist in carrying it on ; and so persist, as to bring upon themselves, for nothing, and with a full knowledge of the consequence, enmity, hatred, danger and death ?"

It is most certain that they would not. In other words, **IT IS CERTAIN THAT**—apart from the Bible—**THE GREAT FACTS OF CHRISTIANITY ARE UNDENIABLY TRUE.**

VII. But it is equally certain that of these facts the Bible supplies the only possible explanation :—and not of these facts alone. Why there should be a nation unlike every other nation, as were the conquerors of Canaan ; why there should be an Egyptian bondage, a Babylonish captivity, a Jewish dispersion ; why there should be a Messiah at all ; why He should have come at that particular epoch in the reign of Cæsar Augustus ; why He should have suffered an ignominious death, although His religion has given new Life to the world : of all these things we may say (in words already quoted)¹⁰ "These facts must not only be admitted, they must be accounted for, and the Bible history is not only the best, it is the only conceivable way of accounting for them."

VIII. The actual connexion between the Facts and the Sacred Books in which they are recorded, is such as to stamp the latter with the authority of a Divine Inspiration. For the facts were brought about in order to establish the doctrines. The works of Christ and of His Apostles, were appealed to as

which Inspiration is alleged, had perished, and if nothing were now before us but the *uninspired* documents of Christianity, (those of the second century.)—I must still be a Christian, although I should often be at a loss as to the separate items of my creed. But now

if the Canonical writings—Inspiration not considered, were dealt with in the historic mode, without prejudice or favour, Disbelief would wither like the grass of the tropics." (Rest. of Bel. p. 127.)

¹⁰ P. 439.

so many infallible proofs of the truth of His words and of theirs. The works that He did bare witness of *Him* : and of them it was also true—He confirmed their word “with signs following.” Besides, as we have already seen, in the Sacred Books, the historic is one with the supernatural. But the supernatural has been shewn (apart from these Books) to be true: the historic therefore is true also ; and God’s works are the testimony adduced to prove the verity of His word.

IX. The cumulative evidence which demonstrates the Truth of Christianity, is still further strengthened by the Force of Congruity.

The direct historical evidence we have seen to be unanswered and unanswerable. But this is not all. The very firmest of our convictions come to us not in the way of a sequence of evidences following each other as links in a chain, and carrying with them the conclusion ; but in the way of the CONGRUITY of evidences, meeting or collapsing in the conclusion. This is not what is called ‘cumulative proof,’ nor is it proof derived from the coincidence of facts. Those impressions which command the reason and the feelings in the most imperative manner, and which we find it impossible to resist, are the result of the meeting of congruous elements ; they are the product of causes which, though independent, are felt so to fit the one the other, that each as soon as seen in combination, authenticates the other ; and in allowing the two to carry our convictions, we are not yielding to the sophism which consists in alternately putting the premises in the place of each other, but are recognizing a principle which is true in human nature.

“ You have to do with one who offers to your eye his credentials—his diploma, duly signed and sealed, and which declare him to be a Personage of the highest rank. All seems genuine in these evidences. At the same time, the style and tone, the air and behaviour, of this personage, and all that he says, and what he informs you of, and the instructions he gives you, are in every respect consistent with his pretensions, as set forth in the Instrument he brings with him. It is not then that you alternately believe his credentials to be genuine, *because* his deportment and his language are becoming to his alleged rank ; and then that you yield to the impression which has been made

upon your feelings by his deportment, because you have admitted his credentials to be true. Your Belief is the product of a simultaneous accordance of the two species of proof: it is a combined force that carries conviction, not a succession of proofs in line.

“It is from the same force of Congruity, not from a catena of proofs, that we receive the most trustworthy of those impressions upon the strength of which we act in the daily occasions of life; and the same Law of Belief rules us also in the highest of all arguments—that which issues in a devout regard to Him, by and through Whom are all things. On this ground where logic halts, an instinctive reasoning prevails, which takes its force from the confluence of reasons.”¹¹

The Bible stands above the sublimest effusions of human genius. It reveals truths concerning man’s highest interests, and lying beyond the sphere where science and genius make their discoveries. It possesses a history altogether unparalleled and miraculous. It produces on individuals and communities such radical and beneficent changes of heart and life, as no other book in the world has even attempted. It claims to have received its grand revelations directly from heaven, and to have transmitted them under such infallible guidance as entitles it to be regarded as the oracle of God. And if, on the ground of the evidence internal and external, this claim be not conceded, then—in its structure, in its characteristic truths, in the simplicity and majesty of its style, in its matchless portraiture of Christ, in its influence on the world—the Bible is a greater miracle than the miraculous inspiration which naturalism would set aside.

Considered merely as a book of morality, the Bible is incomparably a more complete, intelligible, and popular manual than any other composition. In whatever relates, either to the great principles whence virtue should emanate, or to the detail of the virtues and the vices, or to the application of general rules to particular occasions, the inspired writers leave nothing to be desired, or even imagined, in the way of perspicuity, or definitiveness, or of diversified expression and exemplification. In the plain matters of duty, of temper, and of

¹¹ Restoration of Belief, p. 103.

social behaviour, the Bible comes home at once to the understanding of the rudest part of mankind ; and is very nearly the same book to the peasant, as to the doctor of divinity. But “the morality of the Bible excepted, no ethical system, oriental or western, has ever appeared which might not fairly be described as a splendid enormity, or a glittering fragment, which owed all its value to the spoliation of some spurned and forgotten qualities.”¹²

X. It is certain that of this evidence, thus varied and comprehensive, thus congruous and cumulative, our opponents are unable to rebut or to refute one single particle.

“Nothing can be more contemptible than the *argumentative* resources of modern infidelity. *It does not reason, it only postulates* ; it dreams and it dogmatizes.”¹³ Sceptical publications, whether of the present or of former ages, are filled from one end to the other with *objections* against Christianity rather than with answers to the arguments for it. And these are two very different things. “There are objections against a *plenum*, and objections against a *vacuum* ; but one of them must be true.” Objections may be raised by any body, and against any thing : but they invalidate nothing. The histories of Cæsar and Napoleon are liable to objections quite as formidable as any that have ever been urged against the Bible. “This is a prominent feature on the face of the controversy between Christians and their opponents, which must strike every observer. The writings of Infidels—even those little deserving notice—have in almost every instance been carefully answered, from point to point, by Christian authors ; and, in the last century, this was done so effectually, that the Infidels were notoriously driven out of the field, and reduced to a silence in England which has only of late years begun to be broken.” And now that it has been broken, no advantage has been gained on the side of Disbelief. “Our English disbelief can pretend to nothing of originality ; for it is all a copy after the German ; and yet German theories, though they have broken down, in quick succession, at home, have been imported, as if still good,

¹² “ Saturday Evening,” p. 147.

¹³ Professor Garbett : “ Modern Philosophical Infidelity ;” p. 5.

and have been done into English without scruple : is there one of these theories that is not insufferably absurd ? ”¹⁴ “ But on the Christian side, there are many works of high character—well known, standard and popular books . . . to which, as far as we know, NO INFIDEL HAS EVEN PROFESSED TO WRITE AN ANSWER.”¹⁵

Christianity is a fixed and not a floating thing. It “comes to our times as the survivor of all systems ; and after confronting, in turn, every imaginable form of error, each of which has gone to its almost forgotten place in history, itself alone lives”—lives, not as a creature of the mind’s development,—a thing of mere sentiment or intuition, but lives with its firm footing in history, and its powerful hold of men’s hearts. Isaac Taylor has rightly said, that every particle of the German infidelity disappears, when once it is proved that Jesus rose from the dead. But the idealist, entrenched behind his speculative philosophy, will not listen to the proof. He pretends to supersede the question of historical testimony, by raising abstract questions. And this idealism of his own, he dignifies with the name of a religious philosophy, or a philosophical religion, for which we are invited to barter our actual and historical Christianity.

From the abstractions of these dreamers however, we make our appeal to undeniable facts. Until our opponents have disproved the resurrection of Jesus, they have done nothing to the purpose. At present we may say of that resurrection what we have already seen to be true of the Life and Character of Jesus :—there is no infidel theory of either in the field. And the same is true of the character of the Apostles. Let any man read in succession the fourteen Non-Supernatural Epistles. He will spontaneously say of them, “ Whatever I may think of this *Theology*, which is so new and amazing, it is manifest that these writings embody, with great harmony of intention, an elevated and consistent morality ; it would be well for the world if it would receive it. It is also manifest that the writers, whether they be right or wrong in their religious

¹⁴ Restoration of Belief, p. 111.

¹⁵ Bp. Fitzgerald : in the “ Cautions for the Times ;” pp. 503, 504.

belief, are sincere in their profession of it :—it appears also that they are sober-minded, and of good judgment ;—it is clear that they are earnestly affected in relation to whatever is of undoubted importance, and that they treat slightly what we all feel to be indifferent.” Let him then take up any one of the Supernatural Epistles: *e.g.*, that to the Romans. In reaching the close of it he is startled to find the writer, with whose inmost thoughts he had become familiar, boldly affirming that, in a missionary circuit of several hundred miles, he had wrought miracles, in each town and city as he passed. Under the perplexity that has thus arisen, the alternative is just this :—

Either, To yield our belief to Christianity, as a supernatural dispensation ;

Or, To suppose that “the apostolic men, not one of them, but all, stand as a class by themselves, of which no other samples have occurred among the myriad varieties of the species: for they are wise, and mad: they are always virtuous, and always wicked: they are prudent and they are absurd, and they are both in an extreme degree. They are at all times consistently inconsistent with themselves, and with human nature.”¹⁶ He who imagines this to be a caricature, will do well to try and put into his own words, his own idea of the apostles, *the facts duly taken into the account*, on the supposition that no miracles were wrought in attestation of their ministry. He will then perceive how absolutely unavoidable is the sceptical absurdity here enunciated. After all, what does it matter? It is but one of a thousand: a single article in the unbeliever’s creed.¹⁷

¹⁶ “I will not tell you that your supposition as to the apostolic character is ‘uncharitable,’ is ‘unwarantable,’ is ‘ungenerous,’ and the like; for I am content to tell you, what is simply the fact, That it is a jumble of incoherencies to

which no semblance of moral, or of immoral unity can be given. I do not tell you that your conception is wrong and unfair;—for it is no conception at all—it is a naked absurdity!”—(Isaac Taylor: *Rest of Bel.* pp. 218, 219.

¹⁷ THE UNBELIEVER'S CREED.

“I believe that there is no God, but that matter is God, and God is matter; and that it is no matter whether there is any God or no. I

Then again, what about the Gospels themselves? Is there to be found among the Rationalists any single theory which has not been laughed to scorn by themselves? Bauer (as already noticed) has returned to the hypothesis of the Wolfenbüttel fragments, which ascribes the Gospels to deliberate fabrication. But to this the followers of Paulus of Heidelberg still reply that the thing is impossible. The fabrication of the Gospels by Galilean Jews, would be a greater miracle than any there recorded. Besides, Christianity is a FORCE in the world:—a force available for the good of man, not because it is Wisdom, but because it is Power. Whence comes its power? Whence will it come after the world has been persuaded that in the book of history the Gospels must be catalogued along with Frauds?

Perhaps however, the republication of Strauss's *Leben Jesu* is to be taken as an indication of a return to the mythical theory:—a theory indeed, which though inexpressibly absurd, is yet quite as reasonable as any other on the side of unbelief. A theory which, while it fails to account for a single fact, stands out in direct contradiction to every conceivable possibility.

To apply it to the single instance of the Resurrection:—The Apostles had been disappointed, and their faith had failed. Hope, Faith, and Courage, had been buried in their Master's tomb. These might rise again with Him, but they could not raise Him, when they were not themselves revived. And the question is, What revived them? It is idle to say “an altered view of the prophecies,” because that is only suggesting again the same question in another form—What altered their view of the prophecies? Was it some fact? Or was it merely a fancy?

The choice is indeed a hard one; but Scepticism, when driven to the last, will boldly prefer an absurdity to a Miracle. Perhaps the Myth arose of itself,—or else it was produced by

believe also, that the world was not made; that the world made itself; that it had no beginning; that it will last for ever, world without end.

“I believe that a man is a beast, that the soul is the body, and the body is the soul; and that after death there is neither body nor soul.

“I believe there is no religion; that natural religion is the only religion; and that all religion is unnatural. . . Lastly, I believe in all unbelief.”

SOMETHING. "SOMETHING," says Strauss, "sensible to the ear or eye, *sometimes perhaps the aspect of SOME UNKNOWN PERSON*, gave them impressions of an appearance of Jesus."

But this is not all. Let the cause be what it will, or let Myths be mushrooms that spring naturally in some soils without any cause at all, still it is impossible that, *in such a case*, the Myth should have arisen, or, having arisen, should have been propagated. For if the idea of Christ's Resurrection occurred to the disciples at all, it must have occurred to them as a thing *to be proved*. "SOMETHING" may have made it congenial to their own minds; but nothing could have bewitched them to believe it would turn out congenial to the minds of priests and people reeking with the blood of a murdered Messiah. And they must, therefore, have plainly perceived that, in spreading such a story, their personal safety was at stake. We read, accordingly, of their being "straitly threatened" by the Jewish rulers, as intending to bring "on them this man's blood."

Now was ever Myth generated under such circumstances as these?

"Still less is it possible that a Myth should have been *propagated* under such circumstances. The character of Jesus may have produced as strong an impression as you please on his few immediate followers: but to talk of an impression made on a vast multitude who never could have known him familiarly, by a man of low birth and mean fortune—who never performed any dazzling exploit, who was crucified, dead, and buried, and whose body, if He did not rise, must have been forthcoming—an impression so strong as to alter all their strongest national prejudices,—to revolutionize the Faith of their childhood, and persuade them, on no evidence at all, that He had risen bodily, and bodily ascended into Heaven,—this is to talk such nonsense as infidelity alone can venture on, when engaged in the desperate task of evading a Miracle. In the most Mythic age that ever was, this would have been impossible. Myths have been founded on many a religion, but *no religion yet was ever founded on a Myth.*" Christianity, from the first, both professed and believed itself, to stand upon the evidence of testimony: not on preconceived fancies.

“ With these pretensions then, it arose in an enlightened and sceptical age, but amongst a despised and narrow-minded people. It earned hatred and persecution at home, by its liberal genius and opposition to the national prejudices. It earned contempt abroad by its connexion with the country where it was born, but which sought to strangle it in its birth. Emerging from Judæa, it made its way outward through the most polished regions of the world—Asia Minor, Egypt, Greece, Rome: and in all it attracted notice and provoked hostility. Successive massacres, and attempts at extermination, prosecuted for ages by the whole force of the Roman Empire, it bore without resistance, and seemed to draw fresh vigour from the axe; but assaults, in the way of argument from whatever quarter, it was never ashamed or unable to repel; and, whether attacked or not, it was resolutely aggressive. In four centuries, it had pervaded the civilized world, it had mounted the throne of the Cæsars, it had spread beyond the limits of their sway, and had made inroads upon barbarian nations whom their eagles had never visited. It had gathered all genius and all learning into itself, and made the literature of the world its own. It survived the inundation of the barbarian tribes, and conquered the world once more, by converting its conquerors to the faith. It survived an age of barbarism. It survived the restoration of letters. It survived an age of free enquiry and scepticism, and has long stood its ground in the field of argument, and commanded the intelligent assent of the greatest minds that ever were. It has been the parent of civilization, and the nurse of learning; and if light and humanity and freedom be the boast of Modern Europe, it is to Christianity that she owes them. Exhibiting in the life of Jesus a picture, varied and minute, of the perfect human united with the divine, in which the mind of man has not been able to find a deficiency or detect a blemish—a picture copied from no model, and rivalled by no copy—it has satisfied the moral wants of mankind;—and it has retained, through every change, a salient spring of life which enables it to throw off corruption and repair decay, and renew its youth, amidst outward hostility and inward divisions. Yet this religion, and all its moral miracles,—this mighty impulse, which no time or

space can check or exhaust—proceeds, if we believe Strauss and his admirers, from a Myth casually produced in the fancies of some Galilean peasants. The moral world of modern civilization has sprung from the fortuitous concourse of some atoms of Mythology in the brains of unknown **SOMEBOODIES!**"¹⁸

¹⁸ Bishop Fitzgerald: "Cautions for the Times," XXIX.

CHAPTER XVIII.

IT IS CERTAIN : THAT THE CERTAINTY WHICH CHARACTERIZES
THE DEMONSTRATION OF THE TRUTH OF CHRISTIANITY,
IS CERTAINTY OF THE HIGHEST KIND.

“There always exists a class of minds to whom the plain and simple is distasteful ; who have no pleasure in ordinary proofs or unentangled deductions. GIVE THESE MEN WHAT KIND OR AMOUNT OF EVIDENCE YOU MAY, THEY ARE CERTAIN TO DEMAND OTHER AND MORE.”—C. FORSTER.

I. WHAT is the highest kind of certainty ?

From a consideration of the circumstances in which mankind are placed it will appear that the several kinds of evidence, that derived from intuition, from demonstration, from the senses, from moral reasoning, and from human testimony, have each their respective provinces, and, if complete in themselves, carry with them an equal degree of assurance. Any attempt to exalt one of these species of evidence to the depreciation of the rest, is scarcely less unphilosophical than to misapply them. Des Cartes has been justly ridiculed for taking the pains to prove his own existence by demonstration, which he learnt from consciousness. But it is, in fact, a similar absurdity to require demonstrative proof of that which we know by sensation, as the existence of external things, or to demand sensitive proof, or demonstrative proof, or intuitive conviction, of that which is in its own nature incapable of any other evidence than that which is called probable.

“Probable ! well, perhaps so ;” says an objector ; “but as far as the evidence for Revelation is concerned, I should have liked it better if it had been mathematical.” What ! a mathematical demonstration of moral truths ? Is this a *rational*

request? Will the objector undertake to show how it could be possible even to Omnipotence itself, to furnish *demonstrative* proof of an *historical* fact? Or, with his extravagant exaltation of mathematical certainty, will he pretend that he is more certain of the equality or inequality of certain angles in his diagram, than of the real existence of the pen with which he describes that diagram? He has the most perfect confidence in the certainty of mathematical demonstration. Very well: but has he less confidence in the certainty of that operation of the senses by which (in aid of the reasoning faculty) he has arrived at that demonstration? He is sure that mathematical proof will never deceive him. But how is he sure of it? Is it from consciousness? Then is he sure of his consciousness? If not, he is not sure after all. But if he is sure of his consciousness; then he possesses a certainty which is independent of demonstration.

But it will be said, We may with comparative safety trust the evidence of consciousness and that of the senses; it is only "probable evidence" that is untrustworthy. Language, such as this, however, betrays a misconception of the meaning of terms. The word *probable*, when applied to evidence of this nature, "does not imply any *deficiency* in the proof, but only marks the particular nature of that proof, as contradistinguished from other species of evidence. It is opposed not to what is certain, but to what admits of being demonstrated after the manner of mathematicians."¹ But even in the ordinary acceptance of the term, the fact is, that for all the weighty concerns of daily life, men trust implicitly to probable evidence alone. "PROBABILITY is the very guide of life." "Indeed, if it were not just and reasonable to place effectual reliance on what is termed *probable* evidence, the business of the world would soon stand still. Human testimony is the main spring of all that is planned or done at the bar, in the forum, or in the senate. Moral probability is all that we attain, or seek to attain, in politics or jurisprudence, or even in most of the sciences. Nor is it too much to affirm, that every individual

¹ Stewart's Elements of the Philosophy of the Human Mind, vol. ii. ch. iv. sect. 4.

risks without hesitation his health, or his life, or his fortune, or reputation, daily in some way or other, on the strength of evidence of which, if it came to be narrowly examined, would not appear to have half the certainty which we may arrive at, respecting the miraculous deliverance of the Israelites from Egypt, and the veracity of the Mosaic records."¹⁴ It should also be considered that the evidence of a Divine Revelation must not be such as to annihilate the conditions on which man is to be made virtuous and happy, if he is to be made so at all. It must not be inconsistent with the exercises of either his reason or his faith ; nor prevent the play of his moral dispositions, nor triumph by mere violence over his prejudices ; it must not operate purely upon the passions or the senses, nor overbear all possibility of offering resistance. The happiness which God originally designed for his intelligent and moral creatures was a *voluntary* happiness springing out of the well-balanced and well-directed activity of all the principles of their nature. Any revelation, therefore, must proceed on the same basis, both as regards itself and the *mode* in which it is given. Moral evidence is the appropriate proof of moral truth. The evidence that attests the truth of Christianity, vast, varied, and of great cumulative power, though it be, is not, therefore, irresistible. Moral subjects can admit of no evidence which is incompatible with human responsibility. So that to object that Christianity has no certainty because it has not mathematical certainty is the same thing as saying that it cannot be true because it wants the evidence which would deprive men of the liberty of rejecting it.

II. What is it that we want to know ?

We want to know—whence we came—whither we are going ? Whether there be in truth, a tremendous Personality, to whose infinite faculties the “great” and the “little” (as *we* call them) equally vanish—whose universal presence fills all space, in any point of which he exists entire in the amplitude of all his infinite attributes—whose universal government extends even to *us*, and our fellow-atoms, called men ; within whose

¹⁴ Archbp. Sumner’s “Records of the Creation” : vol. i. p. 257.

sheltering embrace even we are not too mean for protection ;—whether if there be such a being, he is truly infinite ; or whether this vast machine of the universe may not have developed tendencies or involved consequences which eluded his fore-thought, and are *now* beyond even his control ;—whether for this reason, or for some other necessity, such infinite sorrows have been permitted to invade it ;—whether, above all, he be propitious or hostile towards a world in which we feel too surely, in the profound and various misery of man, that his aspects are not *all* benignant—how, if he be offended, he is to be reconciled ;—whether he is at all accessible, or one to whom the pleasures and the sufferings of the poor child of dust are equally subjects of horrible indifference ;—whether, if such Omnipotent Being created the world, he has now abandoned it to be the sport of chance, and we are thus mere orphans in the universe ;—whether this universal frame be indeed without a mind, and we are in fact the only forms of conscious existence ; whether this conscious existence of ours is to be *renewed* ; and, if so, under what conditions ; or whether, when we have finished our little day, no other dawn is to break upon our night ;—whether the *vale, vale in æternum, vale*, is really the proper utterance of a broken-heart as it closes the sepulchre on the object of its love.²

But who shall tell us of these things ? Reason ? Science ? Naturalism ? Reason knows nothing of things beyond her province : but this knowledge “is high ;” she cannot attain to it. Science may count the stars, may fathom the depths, may weigh the mountains ; but when we ask, “How shall man be just with God ?” “If a man die shall he live again ?” “Who shall deliver me from the body of this death ?” “What must I do to be saved ?”—Science is dumb : and the silence is broken by Revelation alone. “Lord, to whom shall we go but unto Thee ? THOU hast the words of eternal life !”

“Natural religion is decidedly *against nature*. When, in bewilderment, I have run through its three or four merciless dogmas ; when I have passed a few moments at the bottom of this ice-house, I feel an invincible want of light and heat again.

² The Eclipse of Faith ; p. 59.

I must love, and I must feel myself loved. What should I do with your Supreme Being, your immoveable Creator, to whom I owe my life (and what a life!), and who is waiting me with his balances? I am a sinner; how will you change me? I am sick; how will you heal me? I am condemned; how will you deliver me? I seek a heavenly Father; what have you done with him! I want to pray; what becomes of prayer in your system? These griefs, these injustices in me and out of me, agitate and overwhelm me; what solution do you give me of these problems? These are the only questions worth solving, and you leave them unanswered! I wander confounded among your deserts, finding nowhere the two great Christian solutions—the Fall and Salvation. It is truly the moment to cry with Mary, ‘They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him.’ And without the Saviour, what an indescribable solitude is created around us! If there are only laws; if there is neither Father, Son, nor Holy Spirit; if all intercourse between heaven and earth is interrupted; if the supernatural in Providence has disappeared; if it be not true that the angels ‘ascend and descend,’ oh! what a horrible silence in the whole creation! Your telescopes have extended its limits; you have discovered more worlds; you have obtained a glimpse of nebulae where myriads of suns and worlds, larger than ours, travel in space. Well, so much the worse! The regions you thus people are only the more empty; these myriads of worlds do not make up for the least breath of sympathy and love! Give me back one word of restoration, one word of the Gospel! Deliver my nature from your natural religion, and I shall feel at ease—at home in the midst of this magnificent creation. I shall once more see clear, and my heart will beat! ”³

“It is no especial depth of reflection,” says a well-known continental theologian,⁴ “it is merely an average degree of moral earnestness that we need, to keep us stedfastly gazing on one aspect of human life, and constantly renewing our researches into its nature. I speak,” he adds, “of human life’s *evil* aspect;

³ Count de Gasparin: in “Les Perspectives du Temps Present.”

⁴ Julius Müller.

of the presence of an element of disturbance and discord just where we most intensely feel the need for unity and harmony. This element meets us wherever and whenever our minds review the history of the human race, and its progressive development, *as a whole*. It reveals itself no less clearly in countless ways when we fix our attention upon the *particular* relations of human society, nor can we conceal from ourselves its existence when we look within our breasts. It is a dark shadow which casts its gloom over every circle of human life, and constantly swallows up its gayest and brightest forms."

Is there no possibility of escape from this "dark shadow?" None whatever: if the Bible be not from God. By the narrowness of human wisdom, and the feebleness of human power, we are alike "shut up (*έφρουρούμεθα συγκεκλεισμένοι*) to the faith" of the Gospel. But let that Faith be accepted, and everything is changed. Then the pages of the Bible are seen and felt to glow with the light and warmth of the Sun of Righteousness, who rises on the nations "with healing in His wings." Then "the people who sit in darkness see a great light; and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death light is sprung up." Then Jesus of Nazareth appears —as He is; "The Light of the world:" and he that believeth in Him "shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life." Then is destroyed "the face of the covering cast over all people, and the veil that is spread over all nations;" and life and immortality are brought to light.

Why this is just what we want. This is the great need of mankind. It is the cry for this, that meets us in the pages of our greatest poets—

"An infant crying for the light,
And with no language but a cry!"

in the dying utterance of our greatest sages—"More light!" in the passionate wailing borne across the sea from bereaved mothers in heathen lands—"O God, annihilate or else enlighten me!"

No wonder that a Revelation so exactly adapted to satisfy the cravings of human need should be called a Gospel; "glad tidings of great joy, to all people;" "the glorious gospel of the

blessed God." But after all, its actual value depends entirely on the answer to be given to the question—**IS IT TRUE?** If true, it is precious beyond all price: if untrue, it is nothing better than a mockery, a delusion, and a snare. Thank God! that which, above all things else, makes Christianity to be "worthy of all acceptance," is its absolute and infallible certainty; It is "a FAITHFUL saying."

III. What then is the certainty which the Bible gives? and what the modes by which it is given?

Its facts are certain. Its doctrines are certain. There is a certain corroboration of its history. There is a certain demonstration of its theory. The religion of the Bible is distinguished by its certainty from all other religions whatsoever.

1. **ITS FACTS ARE CERTAIN:** Their monuments are around us. As long as the Jews continue to observe their passover, and rite of circumcision, so long will it be impossible (rationally) to deny the reality of the occurrences out of which those institutions sprang. As long as the Christian Sabbath and the Christian Sacraments are celebrated, so long will it be impossible to account for their existence except by admitting the truth of the facts recorded in the Bible. For observe how the matter stands. The Christian Sabbath is a standing monument:—of what? Of Christ's Resurrection: or—of nothing! The absurdity of this latter alternative drives us back upon the former: and we are consequently more sure of the fact of Christ's resurrection than if we had ourselves witnessed it. For in that case we should have had nothing more than the evidence of our senses; and our senses (we are told) *might* have deceived us: but there is no instance on record in the history of the world, where it is pretended that consequences such as those which have followed in this instance ever did follow from any other than a **REAL** cause. And in this instance, no other cause than the actual Resurrection is even assignable. No other cause is adequate (or can pretend to be adequate) to the effect. It is therefore absolutely certain that Jesus Christ did rise from the dead.

But this Resurrection was repeatedly foretold. Christ himself pointed to it as a proof of the Divinity of His Teaching;

a "sign" of His authority. When He said "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up :" "He spake of the temple of His body." In the verification of the prediction, therefore, we have the proof of the infallibility of the Prophet. But this Prophet accepted and endorsed the whole of the Old Testament Scriptures. He authenticated the leading facts recorded in the Pentateuch ; and described the Jewish Law as "The Law of Moses."

Now if in this He erred, His teaching was not Divine : and His claim to be the Messiah was a false claim : and the omnipotent "God that cannot lie" would not endorse a fraud, by raising Jesus from the dead.

But Jesus did rise from the dead. The Resurrection is a fact. Its monument is before us. And its effect is to demonstrate the Divinity of Christ, and to authenticate the facts recorded in the Bible.

2. ITS DOCTRINES ARE CERTAIN. For they depend upon the facts which were wrought to attest their truth.⁵ Here are no equivocal utterances, no ambiguous voices. Take *e.g.*, that doctrine which meets with such invincible repugnance from modern criticism—the doctrine of The Atonement.⁶ How express are Christ's own words ! "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister ; and to give HIS LIFE, A RANSOM for many."

3. THERE IS A CERTAIN CORROBORATION OF ITS HISTORY:—a corroboration which as shown in the pages of Lardner, Paley, Blunt, and others, no one has ever attempted to gainsay or resist. The same may be said of the discoveries of Rawlinson and Layard ; and of the Sinaitic Inscriptions photographed by Mr. Forster. At a time like the present, when the historic verity of the Pentateuch is so unblushingly assailed, the importance of a work like Mr. Forster's^{6†} can hardly be too highly estimated. By his painstaking and persevering research we

⁵ For examples of the inseparability of the historic and doctrinal elements in Scripture, see, *e.g.*, in Prof. Blunt's "Undesigned Coincidences," the removal of The Ark to the house of Obed-Edom ; and the

call to the apostleship of the sons of Zebedee. ⁶ See APP. Note D.

^{6†} "Sinai Photographed : or Contemporary Records of Israel in the Wilderness." By the Rev. C. Forster, B.D., &c. (Bentley ; 1862.)

have been put in possession of the actual “Contemporary Records of Israel in the Wilderness.” This new Testimony of the Rocks verifies not only the main facts, but also the minute particulars, of the Mosaic history. How is it to be met? “It cannot be answered with supercilious sneers ; it cannot be passed by in silent contempt ; it cannot now be hinted or surmised that the inscriptions are falsely copied, or that some of them do not really exist. Photography cannot be made to lie ; the sun in the heavens will not lend his beams to illuminate and engross a forgery.” A more valuable external testimony to the exact veracity of the Mosaic history than that which these inscriptions on the rocks of Sinai afford, can hardly be conceived. Unconscious witnesses to the truth of God’s word ; a hidden testimony lying unnoticed for ages, but “graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock for ever ;” and at length produced to strengthen the faith of those who believe “all Scripture” to have been written by inspiration of God, and therefore, in the minutest particular, unalterably true.

4. THERE IS A CERTAIN DEMONSTRATION OF ITS THEORY. Its theory is this :—

That man cannot, by searching, find out God ; that God has therefore been pleased to reveal Himself to man. That by nature, man is “dead in trespasses and sins :” but that “God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son.” That the Scriptures are the depository of that life ; because it is by them alone that we can obtain an authentic knowledge of Him, “whom to know is life eternal.” That this knowledge (although the special gift of God) is offered to all (without respect of persons,) on one single condition. That condition is this :—That men shall take God’s word. That they shall believe in Him :—so believe in Him as to obey Him. And on this single condition, God’s promise of absolute certainty as to the Truth of Christianity, may be verified by every man who is willing to comply with the condition.

Could anything be more reasonable? The mysteries of art are known only to the practical artist. The secret of success is the exclusive possession of those who succeed. The demonstrations of chemistry are taken on trust by thousands ; but the knowledge of their absolute certainty belongs to those only

who have conducted the experiments. And it is a certainty analogous to this, but infinitely higher, that results from the same method in religion. No man ever yet tried the EXPERIMENTAL EVIDENCE for Christianity, and found it fail him.

5. THE RELIGION OF THE BIBLE IS DISTINGUISHED BY ITS CERTAINTY from all other religions whatsoever.

The religions of Paganism were merely popular delusions which were deemed essential to the well-being of society.⁷ Their truth was not only not evident; it was non-existent. No one ever pretended that they could be established by evidence: it was deemed enough that they were established by law. With respect to them, truth, and belief in the truth, seem scarcely to have entered men's minds. No wonder therefore that Pilate should be perplexed when, in answer to his inquiries, the founder of Christianity declared Himself to have come into the world for this very end—that he might “bear witness unto the Truth.” (What is truth?) But so it is. The Christianity of the Bible is “The Truth.” Christ’s disciples are “sanctified through the Truth.” They “know the Truth;” and the Truth makes them free. And the reception of Christianity is the reception of “The Truth.” In all this it is not only implied that the religion of Christ is true, and is the only true one; but when the Gospel was first preached, the very *pretension* to truth, the very *demand* of faith, were among its characteristic distinctions. The heathen mythology not only was not true, but was not even supported as true: it not only deserved no faith, but it demanded none. Christianity, on the other hand, is distinguished not merely by the *strength* of its claims, but by their *nature*. Its friends can point not only to the *force* of the evidence in its favour; but also to the fact that it alone dare boldly appeal to evidence.⁸

It appeals to the evidence of Miracles.

The reality of the miracles involved in the creation of the

⁷ “The various modes of worship which prevailed in the Roman world, were all considered by the people as equally true; by the philosopher, as equally false; and by the magistrate, as equally

useful.” (Gibbon’s “Decline and Fall”; ch. ii.)

⁸ See Abp. Whately’s “Essay on some of the Difficulties in the Writings of St. Paul”; p. 8.

first man,⁹ and the history of the first “Sunday,” is not at all affected by the most incessant shouting that “miracles are impossible.” Even Science herself (through the pages of Prof. Babbage¹⁰) has shown the absurdity of disbelief with regard to miracles. The miracles of the New Testament are unique. They are so in themselves ; in their consequences ; in their uniform subordination to moral ends ; and in the character of the witnesses by whom they are attested. If the Christian Miracles were not true, we should then have to confront the greatest miracle of all :—the miracle involved in the existence of Christianity without miracles ! But the Christian Miracles are true ; their monuments still confront us ; and they furnish irrefragable proof that the Christian Religion is Divine.

It appeals to the evidence of Prophecy.

The antiquity of the prophecies that foretell the extirpation of the Edomites, the preservation of the Jews, the coming of Messiah, is undisputed. The pretence that any prophecy of Scripture was mere history, thrown by some forger into the prophetic form, has been driven from its last lurking place in the animadversions on Daniel. The character of these predictions, not less than their singular and exact fulfilment, proves their prevision to be divine. The Prophecies of Scripture do more than foretell, they instruct. They have a preceptive element inseparable from the predictive : and by their Divine Morality as well as by their comprehensive Unity, they are distinguished from all other oracles whatever. It was of Messiah, that “The Prophets,” as well as “Moses, in the Law,” “did write.” The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy. And just as in the miracles of Christianity we see the monuments of Christ’s words and deeds, so we see their foreshadows in those prophetic utterances which “testified beforehand of the sufferings of Christ, and of the glory that should follow.” The vision vouchsafed to Peter on the Mount of Transfiguration made him an eye-witness of Messiah’s majesty ; he saw “the excellent glory ;” he heard the attesting voice : but typed on the pages of the Bible, and imprinted on the history of nations, is an evidence more infallible than that of the senses ; an

⁹ Vide supra, pp. 333, 334.

¹⁰ The Ninth Bridgewater Treatise.

evidence which he who runs may read ; “a MORE SURE word of prophecy.”

It appeals to the moral fitness of its doctrines, and the moral excellence of its precepts.

Is there any other system which unfolds to us the diagnosis of our moral malady ? which gives us at once, the knowledge of the disease and the knowledge of the cure ? Any other which explains the nature, and supplies the antidote, of the moral evil within us and around us ? Give us only the parable of the lost sheep, and of the prodigal son ; a Reconciler who can bring to an end our long estrangement and alienation from our Father in heaven ; a Deliverer “mighty to save” ; “Christ our Passover, sacrificed for us ;” even “The Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world !” and we want no other proof that the Bible is from God, and Christianity divine. Its adaptation to our need is perfect. “We have *found* Him” our souls so long have sought ; and we clasp the precious truth to our heart—It is “a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners.”

It appeals to the moral character of its penmen and preachers.

For this alone presents a phenomenon inexplicable if not divine.ⁿ The Christian miracles are the result of Divine Power ; the prophecies of Divine Knowledge ; the moral excellence of the teaching flows from Divine Goodness ; and the moral character of the teachers, from Divine Purity. So that Christianity may be said to be built on these four immovable pillars ;—the power, the wisdom, the goodness, and the purity of God. But although the manifestations of the Divine Presence may be seen conspicuously in these particulars, they are not confined to these. The verity of Inspired Scripture is attested by external history, in such minute particulars, and to such a large extent, that a recent writer forcibly remarked that the shortest way of dispelling Scepticism would be by a thorough investigation of St. Luke’s account of the voyage of St. Paul (Ac. xxvii). And internally it is attested (independent of its moral traits) by those innumerable and “deeply-latent coincidences, which, if fraud employed them, overreached fraud

ⁿ Vide supra, pp. 371-374 ; 423-425.

itself ; lying so deep as to be undiscovered for nearly eighteen centuries, and only recently attracting the attention of the world in consequence of the objections of infidels themselves."

It appeals to those undeniable facts which prove that it cannot but be true.

If the Bible be merely human, how came it to be written ? How came it to be so very widely different from every other book ? Above all, how came its writers to be Jews ? For the Jews (as Theodore Parker truly says,) were "a nation alike despised in ancient and modern times." Yet it is from this nation that we receive a book to which neither Greece, nor Rome, nor Italy, nor England can offer any parallel. Here is a miracle, open to all men's view, which not even that sturdiest disbeliever of "supernaturalism" can deny or question.

But besides being written, the Bible has been believed. How came it to be believed at first, if it is not true ?

And first as to the New Testament. If the alleged facts there recorded have no reality they are romance of the most monstrous kind. But how came these fictions, containing such monstrous romance, and equally monstrous doctrines, to be *believed* ? To be believed by multitudes of Jews and Gentiles, both opposed and equally opposed to them by previous inveterate superstition and prejudice ? How came so many men of such different races and nations of mankind to hasten to unclothe themselves of all their previous beliefs in order to adopt these fantastical fables ? How came they to persist in regarding them as authoritative truth ? How came so many in so many different countries to do this *at once* ? And yet it is not only certain that they did so ; but (as already shewn) these "very peculiar fictions" were believed by many *before* they were even compiled and published !

As to the Old Testament : How are we to account for the intense, obstinate, and unanimous belief of the Jews for so many ages, and afterwards of their enemies, the Samaritans, not only in the historic character, but also in the Mosaic authorship and inspiration of the Pentateuch ?—a belief never troubled by a shadow of doubt or suspicion, or contradicted by one echo of opposing testimony ; a belief which they were ever palpably interested in throwing off, if *erroneous*, and yet which they

would sooner die than surrender ! This *fact* is in itself equally incomprehensible—if the Pentateuch be indeed un-historic—at whatever date we fix its composition. If these monstrous fables were from the beginning foisted on the nation as the true history of the events in which it originated, how can we account for its unanimously accepting them, and proceeding to mould the national life, laws, and manners upon them ? Above all, how shall we account for this people's affirming, *in this case*, that they had *seen* marvels, which every body was appealed to as having seen, but which they knew had never been wrought ; and on that egregious faith—or rather *lie*—proceeding to bend their necks to a burdensome yoke of laws and ceremonies, which in the language of Peter, “neither they nor their fathers had been able to bear ;” and then (to complete the thing) handing down through all coming ages, without one misgiving of heart, one protesting whisper of conscience, this unanimous and stupendous lie ? At the very least, how can we imagine the nation moulding its life, forming its institutions and manners, on what that whole nation knew, by the very appeal to it, to be a pure romance ?

It is these very difficulties that principally incline our modern sceptics—who are at all events resolved to get rid of the miraculous element—to contend for the *late* composition of the Pentateuch. But if *that* theory be adopted, we are soon led to some similar difficulties, and equally insurmountable. For if this book was really a late composition—long after the nation had a history of its own, and had got (no one can tell how) its institutions and its laws—how came the Jews unanimously to endorse books in which that history is throughout so egregiously caricatured ? Above all, how came they at that time of day, to vouch for supernatural fictions of the most monstrous character so freely superfused over the whole Mosaic books ? How came they, at so late a period of their annals, to accept without a dissentient voice this document as their true history ? how came they to be universally hoodwinked, so as not to perceive the juggle that was being passed upon them, or so universally wicked as to join, without a murmur that has ever reached their posterity, in adopting, consecrating, and handing down the cheat ? not one of them even for a moment

relenting, in a momentary treason to this conspiracy of wickedness, so far as to express doubt or detestation of this prodigious and unanimous lie? How could they do it if they would, or how would they do it if they could? How ought we to characterize the supposition of the whole Jewish nation, and even their bitter enemies the Samaritans, receiving, as no less than inspired truth, these impudent contradictions of their true history, and, when first published, of their very *senses* and *consciousness*, to boot! "Again, how came this singular people to receive, not only as historically true, but as worthy of suffering martyrdom for, if called to it, records which, if not history, are but one long *libel* upon themselves? Would this make them more willing to toil in procuring credit for that enduring and unanimous lie, by which alone these records could be effectually consigned to the veneration of posterity? Would not all patriotism, as well as everything else, lead them to denounce chronicles which are but little else than chronicles of their shame!"¹²

¹² Mr. Rogers's "Vindication:" Letter V. "If I may judge from one or two hints in Part I., I fancy our author will endeavour to prove that the Pentateuch is a series of fictions, composed as a sort of Jewish 'Library of Useful and Entertaining Knowledge,' by Samuel or Nathan or Gad, or all of them; much as *Æsop* composed his 'Fables,' or *John Bunyan* his 'Pilgrim's Progress;' that though they everywhere protest they are telling mere matter of fact, and somehow uniformly produce the effect that they *meant* to do so, and everywhere appeal to God that they speak in His name and by His authority, yet they really meant nothing of the kind at all: that on the other hand, the Israelites, finding that all this was very delightful reading—though they, as well as all their forefathers, are branded and libelled

in every page, 'are huffed and cuff'd and disrepectit,' are told that they will never come to any good, that they will always prove an 'obstinate, stiff-necked generation,' and will at length (which has curiously come to pass) be scattered among the nations, and become 'a hissing, a bye-word, and a proverb,'—yet were so tickled with this pleasant story-book, that they were somehow completely taken in, fancied it was their *true history*, and forthwith handed it down, without one sound of protest, doubt, or repugnance, to all future generations, as not only true in fact, but as divinely inspired! Here is likelihood, here is wisdom! I cannot say *Credat Judæus*, for certainly no Jew ever would or did believe such nonsense; credulous scepticism alone is equal to that." (Ibid. p. 101.)

Another undeniable fact is that of the mutual relation, the perfect agreement, the complete unity, which we have already seen to exist between the Old Testament and the New. Situated as were the writers, collusion was impossible ; and yet they everywhere present us with the same central Truth. If the Gospel comes with the glad announcement that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin ; it comes as the complement of the Law, which had previously made it notorious that "without shedding of blood" there could be no remission. If the great apostle of the Gentiles shows us "Christ our Passover, sacrificed for us ;" it is the great prophet of the Exodus that shows us the full meaning of those precious words :—"The blood shall be to you for a token ; and when I see the blood I will *pass over* you." From Moses to Malachi, every Jewish writer of Holy Scripture points us to The Messiah who should be cut off, but not for Himself ; and their Christian successors, with one voice, bid us "Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world." Prefigured in types, foretold in prophecy, and recorded in history, the fact is incontrovertible, that Jesus Christ has come, to make an end of sin, and to bring in an everlasting righteousness. If we admit the action of a Divine Superintendence, choosing its own heralds, and giving to each his separate proclamation, then we have a consistent and satisfactory solution of the problem furnished by the agreement of the sacred writers. But without this admission, it is a problem which eighteen centuries of sceptical speculation have failed to solve.

Take the New Testament alone. Our adversaries themselves tell us of its "unapproachable greatness." Let them account for this greatness. It is an undeniable fact. It must have a cause ; and the cause must be adequate to the effect. But no such adequate cause has ever yet been assigned but one,— "Inspiration of God."

Take the problem presented by the life and character of Christ. We have seen the proofs of His superhuman spotlessness, wisdom, power. The Christian doctrine says that He was Divine : and in so saying it does what no other doctrine has ever done—it accounts for the facts. The truth of the fact is a phenomenon : the truth of the doctrine accounts for the

phenomenon. And the undeniable fact that no other explanation ever yet attempted does account for the phenomenon, proves that the Christian doctrine cannot but be true.

Take the success of Christianity. Other religions (Mohammedanism, for instance,) have succeeded by the sword. Christianity succeeded against the sword. Others have been established by the power of the State in this or that particular nation. Christianity was established in opposition to the power of the mightiest empire of antiquity ; and has spread throughout the world. Other religions, set up by sages and philosophers, after a brief and decaying existence have been buried beneath their own corruption. But Christianity, with fishermen and tent-makers for its apostles, is an indestructible Power, equal to the regeneration of a world.

Here then is another undeniable fact. And if the Bible is true, the fact is fully accounted for. For this is that which was foretold by Daniel the prophet :—“In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed.”¹³ But if the Bible is not true, what then ? Why, then, the success of Christianity—with all its inexhaustible and inestimable benefits for the millions of mankind—is *the success of a LIE!*

Now we might make our appeal to the evidence furnished by these several particulars taken singly ; for there is not one of them that is not sufficient to demonstrate the truth of our proposition. What then must be their *united* force ? Yet it is their united force that the unbeliever has to resist. He has to account not merely for one or two (though he has never got that far yet,) but for all the moral phenomena presented by the Composition of the Bible, Its unparalleled Preservation, Its unrivalled Effects, Its relation to Christ, The Life and Character of Christ Himself, and—under circumstances peculiarly adverse and unprecedented—The Success of Christianity. Inability to account for any one of these is fatal to his cause. Together, they furnish a combination of moral proof which—when men are willing to be convinced—is found to be perfectly

¹³ Da. ii. 44. Cf. The corresponding declarations in the Gospels : e.g., (Lu. x. 9.) “The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you.”

irresistible ; and which—be they never so unwilling—is always unanswerable.

And yet these proofs, strong as they are, are our weakest. They are more prominent indeed, but not more potent than those MORAL CONGRUITIES which, as we have already seen, though not strictly definable, do more really, though unconsciously, sustain our belief, than these formal “proofs in line.” “The vast difference, as to its bearing upon our principles of action, and our every-day habitudes, between catenary reasoning and THE FORCE OF CONGRUITY, is felt in the instance of the argument concerning Christianity more than perhaps in any other case that could be named.” Theoretically, the demonstration of the truth of that Belief is complete, without any reference to The Force of Congruity ; but practically, our religious convictions come to us in much the same way, as convictions on other subjects. And it is notorious “that those of our convictions upon which we are accustomed to act with the most unhesitating confidence, and to which we commend ourselves without fear, when life itself, or estate, is at risk, are *not*, or seldom are, those which we may obtain by processes of catenary deduction ; or by a course of reasoning which, in a technical sense, is logical. It is not so. Man such as we find him on the beaten road of real life, is no such syllogistic automaton as that he should bring propositions in threes to bear upon the business and conduct of every day. Pedants do this, and break their heads in consequence. It is by the force of congruous evidence—it is by help of wind and tide together, that we launch upon the dangerous atlantic of life, and cross it in confidence, and reach port in safety.”

But the best proof, after all, is the one least thought of. It is least thought of because it is most practical : and in religion men prefer the speculative to the practical. It is the best proof, because it is the shortest, and the surest : it is within the reach of every man, and it puts an end to controversy.

Here is a bit of phosphorus. No ; says a bystander : you are mistaken, it is no such thing. How shall I best make good my assertion ? I may trace back its history before it came into my possession. My servant bought it, by my order,

from the chemist, who said it was phosphorus. Reasonable evidence, certainly ; but not absolutely conclusive. I supplement it however, by pointing out the exact resemblance between the alleged and the real phosphorus. But I am again liable to be told that my specimen is too light or too heavy, too dark or too hard. Tired of this gainsaying, I *try* it ; and as the bright and vivid flame breaks forth before my eyes, I exclaim, "There can be no possible doubt about it ; just see how it burns !"

It is this evidence, the experimental, that is alone demonstrative and final. And this evidence of its own infallible Truth, Christianity puts within the reach of every reader of the Bible. Even this evidence however admits of different degrees of certainty. Proverbially true as it is that "seeing is believing," it is not less true that the sense of sight is capable of being deceived. But men cannot in the same manner be imposed upon in the matter of feeling. An attack of tooth-ache, or of gout, is a matter of feeling too real to admit of mistake. And mental emotions are not less real than physical. The pang of bereavement, whether endured in desolate widowhood, or by

"The heart of Rachel, for her children crying,"

is a thing whose reality was never doubted yet—by any one who has felt it.

And so is the sorrow for sin.

And it is the CONSCIOUSNESS of this painful reality that constitutes the beginning and foundation of that CERTAINTY which (—characteristic of Christianity—) is possessed by every man who has made the religion of Christ, matter of experiment.

The case stands thus :—

Whoever is willing to DO God's will, shall KNOW the truth of Christianity.

Now what, in its relation to mankind, is God's will ? Here is an explicit declaration of it :—"God now commandeth all men everywhere to repent." This command to repent, is a very different thing from a dreamy speculation on the doctrine of repentance. The doctrine itself is distasteful and disagreeable to the mass of mankind. What the Bible says of the nature of repentance, they regard as the exaggeration of hyper-

bole: What it says of the necessity, is contemned as the intolerance of dogma. The language of the penitential Psalms, of the Prophets, of the Apostles, on the subject of Sin, and its consequences, is to them, alike incredible and inconceivable. But how is it with the man who has—in this first particular—begun to do God's will? Why, the Scripture is fulfilled in him. He has begun to *know* God's truth. He has received a conviction of the actual truth in his own case which, painful as it is, constrains him to adopt the strong language of Scripture as being the exact and adequate expression of the sorrow of his overburdened heart.

For such a man however, there is now another expression of God's will. What should he do (he asks,) that he may work the works of God? And the answer is, "This is the work of God; that ye believe on Him whom He hath sent." This is the command to believe. And he who obeys this command finds "joy and peace in believing"—"the peace of God that passeth all understanding;" a "joy unspeakable, and full of glory." He finds a fresh and irresistible proof that the doctrine is true. He is now more than ever determined to do God's will. Again he finds it in (what he has now proved to be) God's Word:—"This is the will of God, even your sanctification." He "follows after holiness;" he makes it the first business of his life to "grow in grace," and to attain "the stature of a perfect man in Christ Jesus;" and in so doing he receives that "unction from the Holy One," that transforming "from glory to glory," in a word, that perfect proof which nothing but practical obedience can supply; he "knows" that the doctrine is true, that the beatific vision is a glorious reality, and the pure in heart shall see God.

He KNOWS: not by an external attestation, but by a consciousness divinely inwrought within him. And to deprive him of this absolutely certain knowledge, you must first deprive him of that consciousness which constitutes his identity. So profoundly and literally true is the Scripture which saith "He that believeth hath the witness IN himself."

"But" (says some objector,) "I don't understand one word of all this; and I don't believe it, either; and (what's more) I don't mean to." God pity you! and bring you to a better

mind! Why should you persist in that unbelief which a simple experiment would dispel? It is one of the unalterable Moral Laws by which God governs the world, that "none of the wicked *shall* understand; but the *wise* shall understand." And "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." And "the secret of the Lord is with them that fear Him." "There is a path which no fowl knoweth, and which the vulture's eye hath not seen." There is a wisdom, of which "The depth saith, It is not in me; and the sea saith, It is not with me." But let him that lacketh that wisdom, "ask of God." He who could say "I understand more than the ancients," found the cause—not in his natural abilities, not in his natural acquirements, but—in this: "Because I keep thy precepts." The servants at the marriage in Cana knew that of which the "governor of the feast" was ignorant, simply because they had been engaged in the work of doing God's will. Inferior in everything else, they were superior in this:—a perpetual illustration of the significance of that word—"Whatsoever HE saith unto you, do it." It is a rule of universal application—do not question it, do not dispute it, but—DO IT. And the result is infallibly sure—"Then shall we know, if we follow on to know the Lord."

"But the thing is inconceivable!" Perhaps so: just as a description of the sweetness of honey, or the fragrance of the rose would be inconceivable to an Esquimaux or a Greenlander. But let the thing be reduced to experiment. Transfer the frozen barbarian to a southern clime, and he will not only confess that the (inconceivable) thing is real; he will exclaim that the reality is one which infinitely transcends all possible description. Just so the practical believer with his Bible. He has "tasted that the Lord is gracious;" "tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come"; and the taste is "sweeter than honey and the honeycomb."

When Franklin went out into the thunderstorm to fly the kite which was to test his theory of electricity, he was agitated by indescribable hopes and fears. But when the critical moment arrived—and passed: when (quivering with trepidation) he applied his knuckle to the key, and the lightning flashed forth—then all doubt was at an end. Then he *felt* the truth of

what before he had but believed. And the flashing of the light which reveals the Truth of "God's word written" in the heart of a believing Christian, is as much more certain as it is more abiding. It is no transient phenomenon. It is a Paraclete that comes to abide with him for ever. It makes him a witness to whom God Himself appeals.¹⁴ And the appeal is not in vain. It is answered from the depths of desolation and misery in the cry of the hoary patriarch—"I KNOW that my Redeemer liveth!" It is answered by those who had been drawn "out of many waters"—"They that KNOW Thy Name will put their trust in Thee!" It is answered by him who sacrificed ease, and friends, and fame, and life itself, exclaiming—"I know in whom I have believed!" It is answered by the universal church, the sacramental host of God's elect,—"We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know Him that is true." Thanks be unto God! for His unspeakable gift. "THE FOUNDATION STANDETH SURE: THE SCRIPTURE CANNOT BE BROKEN."

IV. But if the evidence is thus overwhelming, how can it fail to produce universal conviction?*

1. Because it fails to secure a fair examination. In most cases it has never been examined at all. It is the prevailing fashion in many quarters to ignore the evidences altogether; to pass them by with a proud sneer as antiquated and effete, and to judge the Gospel according to the conceptions of the individual mind. In other words, the case is prejudged, whilst the witnesses are unexamined. And in other cases, when an inquiry into the evidences has been entered upon, it has been with a lurking wish that the examination, after all, might prove unfavourable. In such circumstances, the judgment is biassed by the inclination, and the inevitable result is that what the man wishes to be false, he can never believe to be true. It was a moral cause which produced Jewish unbelief; a state of mind that, relatively to itself, weakens evidence the most powerful, and darkens evidence the most brilliant. And modern infidelity, whether speculative or practical, may be traced to a

* Is. xlivi 10, 12; xliv. 8.

like moral cause—the repugnance in human nature to what is purely spiritual and divinely authoritative.

2. But whatever be the causes of unbelief, want of evidence is not one of them. If further proof of this be wanting, we have it in the fact that the wildest Credulities of Scepticism itself are eagerly embraced without any evidence whatever. Lord Herbert of Cherbury cannot believe that St. Paul heard a voice from heaven ; but is quite sure that he himself heard one, and saw “the place from whence it came.” So that his book (“De Veritate”) which denies the existence of an external revelation, which tells us it would be superfluous if given, is made to come to us attested by such a revelation ! “We are expected to believe in a work which denies the supernatural, because its author has been assured of its truth by means of the supernatural ! Lord Herbert is an existence of such importance, that a revelation has been made to him ; but the great heart and soul of humanity in all past time, *that* has not been an existence important enough to have been so favoured.”¹⁵

And in our own age—so cautious, so critical, so profound,—the visions of Daniel and of John are to be superseded by the shallow imposture of the “Poughkeepsie Seer.” Robert Owen, after schooling us about our religious credulities for half a century, issues a “Manifesto” “to all Governments and Peoples,” announcing his belief in “spirit-rapping.” Let any one read the Atkinson-Martineau correspondence, or the assertions of Home and Howitt ; let him note the feats of modern conjuring, called by another name ; let him observe that the people who believe in these spirit-rappings, are almost uniformly people who know not how to believe their Bibles ; and then let him if he can, deny that “the beliefs to which many modern sceptics have brought themselves, rather than believe the Bible, are such as to demonstrate that the question at issue is really no question of *evidence*, but simply one of liking or disliking, of love or hate.”

“And has not A PUNITIVE DEBILITY invaded the mind that can meditate upon the character of Him whom the evangelists describe, can muse upon his pregnant words, can imagine the

¹⁵ Dr. R. Vaughan.

awful serenity and gentle mercy of his tones, can stand by while he calls the dead from the bier, or the grave ; can behold him stilling the winds, can hear him remit sins, or announce the judgment which himself is to administer ; or claim and accept the adoration of his followers ; can follow him at length to the mount of death, can listen when, about to ascend to his throne, he challenges to himself universal dominion ; and after thus walking side by side with one such as was Jesus, can profess to have seen nothing, and to have heard nothing, but what is on the level of mere humanity ? No blindness is like the blindness of such a mind ! Infatuation, when it extends so far, is not simple error, but disease.”¹⁶

¹⁶ Isaac Taylor.

CONCLUSION.

It is a serious question for those who reject the Bible—What if it should turn out to be true after all? What if my unbelief should be nothing better than that “strong delusion” which can even unsuspectingly “believe a lie”? What if my aversion to the Bible should appear to have its rise in my secret dislike for the irksomeness of its moral restraints, and the elevation of its moral purity? What if there should, after all, be a future fulfilment of those fearful words—“Behold, ye despisers, and wonder, and **PERISH!**” It is a terrible possibility—to say the least of it. Nothing is more certain than that it is a possibility which no prudent man would be content to risk.

And even on the other supposition :—that the Christian’s Bible is a fable. Still it does for him what my no-creed cannot do for me. It raises him in the scale of being. It animates him with the hope of a future life. It arms him with comfort and with courage, under the ills of the present. It makes him a happier and a nobler man than my present mood can ever make me. His *fabulous*, (as I deem it,) is better than my *true*!

May we not suggest to one thus soliloquizing that there is another consideration, of which even he cannot fail to feel the force? Even those who doubt whether Christianity is demonstrably true, do not attempt to deny the great probability in its favour. But probability, in all other cases, they deem a sufficient ground of action. Why not in this too? “Ah! those cool heads and skilful hands which pilot the little bark of their worldly fortunes amidst such dangerous rocks and breakers, under such dark and stormy skies, what *can* they say if asked why they gave up all thought of religion on the score of doubt, when its hopes are at least as high as those of the schemes of

earthly success, and its claims at least as strong as those of present duty? What *will* they be able to say?"

It is a grave question. Like him who ventured to the wedding feast without a wedding garment, he to whom the Judge and King shall put that question may well be "speechless!"

But the Certainty of the Christian argument has other bearings.

There is the sincere believer, whose faith however is sometimes perplexed with Difficulties, sometimes staggered by Doubts. How should he best be able to resist and to overcome?

Difficulties are either speculative or practical. It is the latter which furnish the essential elements of the combat and the conquest, the struggle and the triumph, of the Christian life. But they all disappear before the patient, prayerful, persevering effort of the disciple who is learning to say, "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me." It is the former, as affecting faith rather than practice, with which we are here concerned. And these again may be divided into two classes: They are either critical or moral.

Critical Difficulties (it should be remembered,) whatever demand they may make upon our diligence and skill, are matters of opinion. But there is not one of them which goes deep enough to affect our faith. You may be unable to remove the difficulties presented by the genealogies in Matthew and Luke, in Kings and Chronicles; for you are not in possession of full information on the subject. But the great truth which those genealogies are adduced to prove, remains intact. Jesus Christ has come—of the tribe of Judah—and of the house of David. If the criticism expended by Dr. Colenso had succeeded, as completely as it has failed, still, not one of the great facts of the Bible history would have been altered. As far as practical results are concerned, all such criticism is entirely nugatory. "He that believeth shall not make haste." In his patience he will possess his soul. Tell him that you have found—or (since it is not found yet,) that you are going to find—some human tooth or jaw in the buried forest of Cromer; and you will find him quite prepared. Propose to him a thousand difficulties

requiring for their solution a greater amount of philological or historical knowledge than he possesses ; and while he confesses that he cannot solve them, he will show you why they cause him no anxiety : there is *not one of them that can touch the foundations of his faith*. There is not one of them that invalidates any of the great facts on which his confidence reposes, immovably secure ; there is not one that pretends to overthrow those unanswerable arguments which demonstrate the reasonableness of his belief ; and, above all, there is not one that can alter the great decisive fact—He **KNOWS** in whom he has believed—and he has “the witness in himself.”

Moral Difficulties—to one possessed of moral earnestness—are perhaps less easily dispelled. But however great their force, it will be remembered that they do not spring from the Bible : they are no creation of Christianity. On the contrary, it is from the Bible alone that we obtain any gleams of light upon them. It is in Christianity alone that we find **HIM** in communion with whom we learn how to regard, and where to leave them. For after all, they are no business of ours : and He who is at once Almighty and All-wise may be safely trusted with the government of His own empire. The punishment of the enemies of God is one which we are not called upon to assign ; and one that we are not competent to discuss. But Faith still asks with confidence, “Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right ?” and tranquilly reposes in the love of Him whom it has *proved* to be supremely wise and good—“a Just God, and a Saviour.”

But Doubts : subtle, painful, paralysing—how shall the sincere Christian rid himself of these ?

First, by a thorough acquaintance with the Christian argument. When this has once been attained, all further doubting will be felt to be weak and irrational. But however irrational, its recurrence is disquieting. Let it then (secondly,) be remembered that the possibility of doubt is a necessary part of our moral discipline. There must be a sphere for the exercise of faith—of hope, sincerity, diligence, patience. If a religious belief is to be the same thing with us as are our moral beliefs ; if it is to act as an influence countervailing other influences, then it must be *possible* for us to disbelieve. There

could not be a Christian, in a world constituted as this is, if there were not always room for a man to be an Infidel. But while doubts and difficulties are thus necessary to us all, there is no more exacted of us, in this respect, than is necessary to secure for us ultimately an eternal exemption from them. Meantime, there is one grand remedy for the sorest of them :—faith and holy living.¹ He who cries importunately “Lord increase my faith !” will soon find in his bosom a key that will turn the most massive lock in Doubting Castle. And he whose “fellowship is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ,” shall soon find his doubts exchanged for “the full assurance of faith.” While others—because they cannot have that certainty which the necessity of the case excludes—decline the trial, and “account themselves unworthy of eternal life,” the path of the just shall shine brighter and brighter until the day dawn, and the glorious words be heard—“Welcome, child of clay ! welcome to that world where there is NO MORE NIGHT.”

And those who KNOW the Certainty of the things wherein they have been instructed :—what mortal lips shall utter the responsibility that this knowledge involves !

THE RELIGION OF CHRIST IS TRUE: THEN IT IS TREMENDOUSLY TRUE.

For those who are at ease in Zion; who have a name to live and are dead ; who have left their first love ; who merely say Lord, Lord, but take up no cross, nor follow Him withersoever He goeth—Christianity is tremendously true.

But for those to whom the Kingdom of God has come “not in word but in power,” Christianity is a reality of “joy unspeakable, and full of glory.” How this joy is intensified, and this glory made exceeding glorious, when we habitually cherish the consciousness of its abiding certainty ! “A kingdom that cannot be moved !” A Saviour who ever liveth ! How it gives wings to prayer—this *consciousness* that we are breathing our

¹ The advice given to Arnold (by one of his friends) when he doubted, was excellent :—“To cure himself, not by physic, (that is, reading and controversy,) but by diet and regimen (that is, holy living”). Stanley’s Life of Arnold: vol. i. p. 22.

wishes into the ear of the Lord of Sabaoth ! How it quickens holy living, to *know* that the Father Himself loveth us ! How it gives zeal to our efforts and purity to our motives, to "know" that our labour is not in vain in the Lord ! How it humbles us—this experience of God's Fatherly goodness ! How it comforts us—this assurance of His faithfulness ! "Strong consolation," truly : and "by this we believe and are SURE."

Let us then HOLD FAST the profession of our faith. Let us not cast away our confidence. Let no man beguile us of our reward. Let us endure as SEEING Him who is invisible. Sixty centuries are looking down upon us. We are encompassed with a great cloud of witnesses. We have the evidence of things not seen. Let us be strong and quit ourselves like men. Let us gird up the loins of our minds, be sober, and hope to the end. While, from those "statutes" which we have taken for our "songs" in the house of our pilgrimage—stirring as the blast of martial trumpet, soothing as the sound of whispering leaves—there comes a strain of heaven's own music—

"Ye, beloved, building yourselves up on your most holy faith, praying in the Holy Ghost, keep yourselves in the love God, waiting for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ."

APPENDIX.

NOTE A. Page 225.

It has been stated that the Flint-implements exhibit, in many instances, all the marks of a rubbing down of their artificial surfaces by attrition with the gravel in which they lie; but it is worthy of note, that the converse of this relation of the surfaces left by nature and art is to be witnessed in not a few specimens, the pebbles or fragments of the native flint nodules having manifestly been rolled and abraded *before* they were dressed into shape by the human hand. In the former case, the artificial chipping underlies the natural smoothing; in the latter, it overlies it. Now, the occurrence of this latter condition, long ago noticed by M. de Perthes, and lately remarked upon by J. W. Flower, Esq., (in his interesting communication to the Geological Society of London, in June, 1859,) certainly justifies, to some extent, the induction arrived at above, of the possibility—to use no stronger term—of the human work having been buried long after the entombment of the bones of the lost Pachyderms and other animals. We say to some extent, for undoubtedly a portion of the flint-gravel may have become water-worn and rounded by more than one translation of waters over it, during the Tertiary ages, before the last great disturbance or disturbances of the sea, which covered the surface so widely with diluvium, and exterminated so many of the larger mammalia.—The Reputed Traces of Primeval Man: (Blackwood's Magazine, vol. lxxxviii. p. 480).

NOTE B. Page 270.

But here I must refer my readers to the conclusions obtained in the first and second chapters of the same book—viz., those which contained physiological and psychological comparisons. These conclusions carried with them something of positive evidence. In the first chapter it was attempted to be proved—the reader can judge with what degree of success—that tribes of animals, which belong to different species, differ from each other physically in a variety of particulars, in which the most dissimilar of human races betray no such differences. In the first place, separate but even proximate species differ from each other in

respect to the principal laws of the animal economy, as those which govern the duration of life, the periods of utero-gestation, the facts which relate to reproduction. Human races coincide strictly in all those particulars. Secondly, different species of animals, are subjected to different pathological laws, if I may use such an expression. All human races are liable to the same diseases ; at least the varieties which exist in these respects are such as are produced by the influence of climate. Thirdly, distinct species do not freely intermix their breed, and hybrid plants and animals do not propagate their kind beyond at most a very few generations, and no real hybrid races are perpetuated ; but mixed breeds, descended from the more distinct races of men, are remarkably prolific. The inference is obvious. If the mixed propagation of men does not obey the same laws which universally govern the breeding of hybrids, the mixed breeds of men are not really hybrid, and the original tribes from which they descend must be considered as varieties of the same species. In the second chapter which contains psychological comparisons, I endeavoured in the first place, to establish on a broad scale the observation that species, even the most nearly resembling and belonging to the same genera, are endowed with peculiar psychical qualities which are even more distinct, and therefore more characteristic of particular species, than peculiarities of bodily structure ; that all species, in fact, differ from each other in respect to their instincts, or those active principles which with wonderful constancy govern the lives and habits of creatures belonging to each kind, and give to each tribe a uniform and unvarying character. Secondly, that mankind, however they vary in different ages and countries in respect to acquired habits and the arts of life, are yet subjected not less than the inferior tribes to the influence of certain impulses or active tendencies, which, like the instincts of animals, are constant and invariable. Thirdly, I attempted to prove, by a survey of some phenomena illustrative of the psychical character of some of the most dissimilar human races, that they have all common affections and sympathies, and are subjected to precisely analogous laws of feeling, and action, and partake, in short, of a common psychical nature, and are therefore proved, with the same degree of evidence which has been obtained from the general observation above laid down, to belong to one species or lineage. Probable evidence from its nature admits of accumulation, and perhaps it will be allowed that a considerable mass of evidence has thus been collected in support of one and the same conclusion, with respect to the tribes of mankind.

(Dr. Prichard's "Researches into the Physical History of Mankind.")

NOTE C. Page 311.

Let us repeat, in a few words, some of the great facts of creation with respect to which Science has already borne witness to the truth of the Scriptures. Some of these relate to points which must at first sight have appeared most strange and incredible. I shall mention only twenty :—

I. Science has been obliged at last to agree with the Bible in saying that the earth is round—a truth which the learned men of this world long denied.

II. That the earth, as it is written in the Bible, “is hung upon nothing” (Job xxvi. 7),—a truth of which learned men were long ignorant.

III. That the earth has been created out of nothing at a very remote time in the ages that are past—a truth which Science long rejected, believing matter eternal.

IV. That light existed, and caused the plants to live, long before the sun was lighted up to be the light of the world—a truth which Science long regarded as an absurdity or an impossibility.

V. That the crust of the earth rests on the interior fire—a truth only very lately discovered.

VI. That, nevertheless, this crust was long covered by the waters, and rose out of the waters—a truth which Science formerly derided.

VII. That the highest mountains in our globe have been thrown up by the power of the fire—a truth which Science has only been able to see in very recent times.

VIII. That the earth is wrapped round with an atmosphere, and that the air has weight—truths which have been known to Science only since the time of Galileo.

IX. That the atmosphere is charged with a very great work, in separating the waters below from the waters above—a truth which has been admired and wondered at since the calculations of Arago.

X. That the rivers go down by the valleys to the sea, which is never filled, and that they go up again to the places whence they came.

XI. That the winds go in circuits and return in their circuits, as Colonel Reid has been endeavouring to prove only very lately.

XII. That the stars of heaven are infinite in number, like the sand of the sea-shore for multitude, although the human eye can only distinguish about 1,000, and the ancient astronomers believed that there were no more than 1,022.

XIII. That the stars are not gods as the wisest and most religious of the ancient philosophers believed them to be, but material things created by God.

XIV. That the stars have no influence over the destinies of men or nations—although in all former times, and even in the comparatively modern court of Charles V., and of the Valois in France, princes, great men, and people, alike believed in magic, and consulted the stars.

XV. That the sky is not a solid vault, as the ancients believed—a mistake which caused the translators of the Old Testament, both Greek and Latin, to call it “firmament,” according to their own notions of science; whereas the word “firmament” does not give a correct translation of the original Hebrew word, which means “expanse,”—an admirably chosen and expressive word.

XVI. That the plants were created on the earth long before man.

XVII. That the animals of the sea and of the air were created long before those of the earth.

XVIII. That the birds are the cotemporaries of the fishes and other marine animals.

XIX. That the animals and plants have both had a beginning, and that there was a time when neither the one nor the other were in existence.

XX. That man, notwithstanding his own pretensions in all ages, and the frequent assertion of unbelievers, has existed only a comparatively short time on the earth, having been created long after the plants, after the birds, after the marine animals, after the insects, after the reptiles, and after all the terrestrial animals.

Science, you see, is but a child when compared with the Scriptures. (“The World’s Birthday :” By Prof. Gausser, pp. 221-224.)

NOTE D. Page 467.

Let it be argued, as it easily may—very learnedly—on grounds metaphysical, and on grounds ethical, that the Christian doctrine of PROPITIATION for Sin (stated without reserve) is “absurd”—and that it is “impossible”—and that it is “immoral”—and that it is everything that ought to be reprobated, and to be met with an indignant rejection;—let all such things be said, and they will be said to the world’s end—it will to the world’s end also be true that each human spirit, when awakened toward God, as to His Moral attributes, finds rest in that same doctrine of the vicarious sufferings of the Divine Person, and finds no rest until it is *there* found. (RESTORATION OF BELIEF: p. 333.)

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 01012 2465